DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 840 SP 029 494

TITLE The Catholic High School Teacher: Building on Research. Proceedings of the Symposium Based upon the Study: Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers (New York, New York, March 5-7, 1987).

INSTITUTION National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Aug 87

NOTE 85p.; For related document, see ED 261 972.

AVAILABLE FROM Secondary School Department, National Catholic Educational Association, Suite 100, 1077 Thirtieth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20007-3852 ($4.00, members; $5.30, nonmembers).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Catholic Educators; *Catholic Schools; *High Schools; *Religious Education; Research Needs; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This volume is the result of a national invitational symposium that sought to build on the research from "Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers." The full text of three major papers given at the symposium as well as excerpts from presentations by four Catholic high school teachers are presented. The first section of the volume presents a "Consensus Statement," detailing areas on which the participants generally agreed, including the purpose and staffing of the Catholic high school, assumptions about Catholic high schools, and recommendations for such schools. Titles and authors of the major conference papers are: (1) "Mindsets: A Way of Talking about Catholic High School Teachers" (John S. Nelson); (2) "The Self-Understanding of Catholic Secondary School Teachers" (Zeni Fox); and (3) "Building Responsive Catholic Schools: The Need for a Comprehensive, Long Range Diocesan Effort in the Religious Development of Catholic High School Teachers and Administrators" (Robert J. Starratt). (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Kokus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER: BUILDING ON RESEARCH

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SYMPOSIUM BASED UPON THE STUDY:

Sharing the Faith:
The Beliefs and Values of
Catholic High School Teachers

HELD AT:

Fordham University at Lincoln Center
March 5-7, 1987

SPONSORED BY:

The National Catholic Educational Association
Secondary School Department
The Center for NonPublic Education
Fordham University
The Graduate School of Religion
and Religious Education
Fordham University

National Catholic Educational Association

Washington, D.C.
August, 1987

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Building on Research
Michael J. Guerra

Consensus Statement 4

Assumptions, Issues, Recommendations

Conference Papers 8

Mindsets: A Way of Talking About
Catholic High School Teachers
John S. Nelson 8

The Self-Understanding of Catholic
Secondary School Teachers
Zeni Fox 31

Building Responsive Catholic Schools:
The Need for a Comprehensive, Long Range
Diocesan Effort in the Religious Development of
Catholic High School Teachers and Administrators
Robert J. Starratt 49

Responses from Teachers 68

Angela Magliano

John Foley

John Reilly

Bro. Myles Amend, CFC

Par 'cipants 78

INTRODUCTION

BUILDING ON RESEARCH

Michael J. Guerra
Executive Director
Secondary School Department
National Catholic Educational Association

Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers was originally published by the National Catholic Educational Association in 1985. It provided the first systematic exploration of the beliefs and values of a representative sample of Catholic high school teachers, as well as a set of conclusions, recommendations and questions for further reflection and discussion. The report summarized several years of research, but it was not intended to be the last word.

When NCEA sponsors research of this kind, it is usually inspired by hope, driven by experience and constrained by humility. Our hope is that information carefully collected, wisely analyzed and clearly described will be helpful to those who carry out the ministry of Catholic education. But our experience tells us that the gap between research and practice is not ordinarily bridged by a single publication. And so, unlike our colleagues in the sylvan groves of Academe, NCEA takes on the additional responsibility of helping Catholic educators to understand the implications of these findings and to *build on the research.* This is no simple task. Hence a dash of humility is recommended.

In order to meet its commitment to make its research accessible and useful, NCEA's Secondary School Department sponsored a national invitational symposium on *Sharing the Faith* in March of 1987, in partnership with Fordham University's Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education and the Fordham Center for NonPublic Education. Participants included academics and practitioners, national, diocesan and religious community leaders, principals and teachers. The task given to the group: to revisit the research, to reexamine the findings, to articulate implications, to develop recommendations for action--in sum, *to build on the research.*

This publication is the first product of that symposium. It begins with the consensus statement that was generated at the close of the symposium. It includes the full texts of each of the three

major papers prepared for the symposium, as well as excerpts from presentations by four Catholic high school teachers.

A word about the process: the papers developed by Dr. Nelson, Dr. Fox and Dr. Starratt were made available to the participants a month before the symposium. The authors were given the opportunity to make brief statements about their papers and also to respond to comments and questions from participants, but the conference schedule was designed to provide participants with substantial opportunity for active involvement in discussions. A privileged place in the program was reserved for presentations by teachers. While the formal papers and teachers' comments were undoubtedly helpful and influential, they were offered largely as grist for the reflections and discussions of the participants. They served that purpose admirably, and are offered again in the same spirit.

A word about the product: the consensus statement represents *substantial agreement*. At the close of the symposium, neither the participants nor (especially) the planning team were predisposed to attempt to prioritize the lists of factors related in some significant way to either of the two major issues that had been identified, namely concerns about school purpose and staffing. Substantial agreement was not unanimity, and the analysis of shared assumptions, contributing factors and basic issues was not proposed as a *catalogue raisonné*. Nevertheless, what was produced by the symposium's participants is, in my judgment, a most important statement. In these reflections of a thoughtful and committed group of distinguished Catholic educators, we find a bedrock of conviction about the importance of our Catholic schools, the preeminent importance of our teachers and principals, and the urgent need to challenge any complacency about the fundamental relationship between the school's religious purpose and its teaching staff. It is perhaps this challenge to complacency that is the symposium's principal message, and the recurring theme in each of its recommendations. The most important results of this symposium and the original research on which it was based will be found in these recommendations and, ultimately, in the responses of each of the groups to whom they are addressed.

While it is clear that there is a substantial agenda of unfinished business, it is equally clear that, for all the unresolved challenges we face, we are amply blessed by the company we keep. I am grateful to each of the participants for giving so generously of time and talent to help us build on this research in the service of Catholic education. I am especially grateful to those of my colleagues who took on additional boiler-room work to keep the

symposium afloat and moving--Cathy Nelson, Sr. Judith Coreil, Peter Benson; to our commissioned authors, who provided the power of intellect and imagination to get us started--Jack Nelson, Zeni Fox, and Jerry Starratt; and to Fr. Vincent Novak, who added the energies of Fordham's Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education to the university's Center for Non-Public Education in forming a unique partnership with NCEA's Secondary School Department. In many ways, the diversity found among the symposium's sponsors and participants can be seen as a powerful symbol of our potential for mutual support and collaboration. Starting from a variety of different perspectives, the group found common ground in a shared commitment to the ministry of Catholic education and a shared concern for its future. But we should hardly be surprised to find ourselves drawn together by a strength that transcends our reflection on research. St. Paul reminds all of us, teachers, administrators, researchers, that "There are different kinds of spiritual gifts, but the same Spirit gives them. There are different ways of serving, but the same Lord is served. There are different abilities to perform service, but the same God gives ability to everyone for their service. The Spirit's presence is shown in some way in each one, for the good of all" (I Cor. 12:4-7).

CONSENSUS STATEMENT

ASSUMPTIONS

There is substantial agreement on the following assumptions:

1. Catholic high schools have a twofold purpose: academic development and faith formation.

2. Schools make a difference. Catholic schools clearly make a difference in academic development. In varying degrees they do make a difference in faith formation.

3. In meeting this twofold purpose teachers are the most important influence in the school, both as individuals and as a community of educators.

4. The principal's leadership as initiator and supporter of the professional and faith development of the faculty is critically important for the success of the faculty in meeting this twofold purpose.

5. Catholic high schools belong to the whole Church rather than to any particular segment. They reflect the life of the Church in reading the signs of the times and discerning and responding to God's call.

6. There have been profound cultural and ecclesial changes in the United States over the past thirty years. Today there is much greater diversity in how faculty, parents and students understand the Catholic tradition.

ISSUES

Issue One: The purpose of the Catholic high school

There is significant concern among educators that the faith formation purpose of the Catholic high school is increasingly threatened unless carefully planned and sustained action is taken locally and supported more widely.

Some significant factors related to this issue are:

- Church in transition
- Insufficient understanding on the part of some religious communities of the importance of their own role in contributing to faculty faith development
- Lack of clarity regarding the responsibility of all teachers for the faith formation of students
- Lack of clarity about desired student outcomes in the area of faith formation
- Confusion about the language of faith formation, e.g., faith, ministry, integration of faith and justice, lay spirituality
- Lack of clarity about the school's mission
- Inadequate interdisciplinary collaboration within a given high school
- Scarcity of appropriate value-oriented curricular materials in non-religion content areas
- Tension in balancing institutional autonomy and the need for interinstitutional collaboration
- Lack of an articulated spirituality among teachers
- Inadequate opportunity for broadbased participation in shaping a school's self-understanding
- Increased family stress
- Experience of alienation among youth

Issue Two: Staffing the Catholic high school

Catholic high schools are depending increasingly upon the commitment, gifts, skills and leadership of lay teachers. This is a reflection of a larger transition which the Church is experiencing, a transition which brings with it not only new opportunities but also ambiguities about role relationships, self-understandings, financial arrangements, shifting power relationships and issues of authority. While these new opportunities have brought fresh vitality to the schools, unresolved ambiguities create unique challenges.

Some significant factors related to this issue are:

- Inadequate opportunities for spiritual formation of lay faculty (as compared with vowed religious and clerics)

- New but poorly defined expectations for the expansion of the lay teacher's role in faith formation of students, and consequent shifts in the responsibilities of religious and clergy
- Inadequately articulated state of lay spirituality
- Limited competence, confidence and resources to carry out staff development on the local level, especially in faith formation
- Need to provide just compensation for laity, vowed religious and priests
- Inadequate training and support for principal's exercise of leadership in faith formation
- Inadequate opportunities for lay teachers to participate in shaping the school's self-understanding and policies
- Absence of a shared language to support reflection and action with regard to faith development
- Perceptions that many lay teachers have of wavering support for Catholic high schools on the part of some bishops, religious communities and the Catholic community at large
- Difficulty in identifying and integrating the contributions of the non-Catholic teacher to the mission of the Catholic high school
- Need for leadership on the part of religious communities in promoting lay/religious collaboration in the schools

RECOMMENDATIONS

There is substantial agreement that the issues raised by the symposium's reflections on research and practice need to be addressed in complementary ways by various groups within the Church. Specific suggestions are directed to the following:

- THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION is urged:
  1. to move quickly in the development of resources to strengthen the faith formation of teachers and administrators;
  2. to identify and disseminate useful models of successful programs developed by religious communities and dioceses;

3. to give priority to the sponsorship of research which will help determine present outcomes and future needs in this area.
4. to encourage and initiate dialogue and further collaboration with religious/clerical associations who are involved with the educational mission of the church, including CMSM, LCWR, the NCEA Seminary Department and the USCC Department of Education.

- CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES are encouraged:
  1. to promote research, scholarly writing and theological reflection on lay spirituality and the nature of educational leadership for the future;
  2. to participate in a symposium that would focus on the articulation of the mission and spirituality of lay educators; such a symposium should include not only able theologians but also thoughtful educational practitioners.

- BISHOPS are urged to initiate a study of Catholic school financing and to develop and implement a plan of action in response to this study.

- THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE is asked to place the substance of this symposium's proceedings on the agenda of its Education Committee.

- THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION are encouraged to consider the broader issues of this symposium and to support the dissemination and implementation of these recommendations.

MINDSETS: A WAY OF TALKING ABOUT CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

John S. Nelson, Ph.D.

Dr. Nelson is Assistant Chairperson in Fordham University's Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education. He heads its concentration "Adolescent Religious Development; Ministry with Youth and Young Adults." He authors and edits junior and senior high school religion texts for W. H. Sadlier, Inc. He has spent twenty years working in Catholic high schools, for the most part teaching religion.

Introduction

In a classic article on adolescence, Gisela Konopka cites a statement about how people are similar, different, and unique.[1] I would like to substitute "school" and "schools" where the original has "man" and "men" (we can insert just as well "teacher" and "teachers"):

> Every school is in certain respects
> (a) like all other schools,
> (b) like some other schools,
> (c) like no other school.

This paper will speak mainly about how schools are like each other. The kind of project we are doing at the conference seems to call for such generalizations. I want to affirm up front, however, that I am very conscious of the differences among schools, indeed of the uniqueness of each school. This is one of the reasons why ideas and suggestions which may come from our conference will have to be appropriated and "owned" by individual schools if they are to make a difference in them.

By way of outline, this paper will attempt to:

1. clarify the key word of its title: *mindset*;
2. address four complementary mindsets for Catholic school faculties:
   a. *creational* (a realistic humanism based on biblical faith);

b. *covenantal* (a network of human relationships in which each person reaches beyond himself or herself);

c. *discipleship* (a following of Jesus which often is countercultural but should not be counterpersonal);

d. *Catholic Christianity* (socialization into one special tradition which discipleship has taken);

3. propose some evaluations and conclusions.

May I be explicit about why I am proceeding in this way and what I hope to accomplish. The data which are the bases for our conference indicate that there is both a common ground among Catholic high school faculty members and also basic differences. This agreement and disagreement pertain not just to practical matters, but also to the foundational mindset which the faculty members bring to their profession. For this reason, in consultation with other members of the planning committee, I have chosen to explicate and reflect upon four possible basic mindsets which may apply.

The mindsets upon which this paper builds derive from the Scriptures, Christian history, and contemporary human experience. In slightly different form, they underlie the recent pastoral letters of the U.S. bishops, *The Challenge of Peace* and *Economic Justice for All*. I find strong echoes of these mindsets in *Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers*, which provides the main source of empirical data for our conference.

These mindsets do not exhaust possibilities. We could propose many others, especially if we move from religious to social science categories. Nor are they so distinct from one another as the treatment of them here may imply. Teachers, like anyone else, can be very complex persons.

Mindsets

By *mindsets* I have in mind the whole cluster of images, ideas, judgments, affections, convictions, attitudes, etc., which a person has with regard to some reality in his or her life.

For example, I am preparing for this conference with a mindset. I am coming to it with an open mind, I hope, but certainly not with an empty one. From past experience and present anticipation I am aware of a mixture of hope that the conference will go well and be worthwhile, foreboding that it may go amiss and be a loss, questioning whether it may be just one conference among many which may raise hopes but produce no real effects, and a good deal more. I am a "school-person"; I believe Catholic

high schools do much good. I believe also that it helps to bring people together to talk about them. Thus I'll try my best to bring about a profitable conference.

The word *mindset* lies somewhere between unchanging belief and vacillating opinion. The mind is not so set that it is not open to change, but it is set enough that it does not change easily. Whether I am aware of my mindsets or not, they make a difference in how I feel, think, judge, and act.

Mindset includes that whole range of human operations which theologian Bernard Lonergan has called *levels of consciousness*. For the sake of clarity I would like to name Lonergan's four levels and illustrate them in terms of how teachers in Catholic secondary schools may regard these schools. The four levels of consciousness are:

experience (be attentive)
understanding (be intelligent)
judgment (be reasonable)
decision (be responsible)
(and in all be loving)[2]

These levels of consciousness intertwine and interact with one another. In practice they come in no set order. Logically, however, they strike me as clearer if we explain them in the sequence just outlined.

Experience is tied most closely to our senses. We image it concretely, receptively, because experience is given, yet actively, because each of us fashions a different image from the same or similar experience. We each create our own metaphor. Possible images for a school are: an extension of parish and family for sharing faith and values, an arena for competition, a garden or hothouse for growth, a place for friends to meet, a setting for colleagues to work together, a day-care center to keep young people out of trouble, a battleground, a place necessary to earn enough money to live on, etc.

These root metaphors, these basic images through which we envision and react to some reality in our lives, are most important. With regard to faith, for example, sociologist Andrew Greeley has argued very well in *The Religious Imagination* that the way in which we image God (e.g., as close parent or as distant Lord) is far more indicative of a person's faith than the way in which he or she may conceptualize God (e.g., as creator, as lawgiver, as triune, as incarnate).[3]

Understanding sorts out experience into more abstract categories and organizes them into coherent networks. We label data, file them, crossreference them, put them into workable and retrievable order. The more concrete data of experience become more abstract networks of categories. Human beings have had built-in logical systems long before they worked them into computer software. It is especially on this level of consciousness that we locate models, which have been so much in use in recent theological writing.

There are many models for a Catholic school and for the faculty members within one. (This paper will be developing several within wider mindsets.) Examples are: a task-oriented association of persons, a person-oriented community with a focus on human relationships, an agency for socialization into a particular tradition, a consciousness-raising setting to change persons and systems, an organized locus for various ministries to, with, for, and by adolescents.

Though less moving than the images of experience, the concepts of understanding are at least equally as important. The night-before rally or the halftime pep talk may fire up the school team, but they won't win the game if the coach hasn't taught the players individual plays and an overall game plan. We need some way of making sense out of what we are doing.

Judgment means that we evaluate the images of experience and the conceptual schemes of understanding. Do they correspond to objective evidence? Are they internally coherent? Do they make any difference in human life? What and how?

We tend not only to rate models, we also often rank them. We find it cumbersome to operate with multiple models, so we make one of them a supermodel or paradigm. As for other models, we either include them within our supermodel or we exclude them by rejection or neglect.

With regard to the Catholic high school, examples of the *content* of our judgments are pretty much the same as those suggested for experience and understanding. The *process* can take place informally and indirectly by the way school just happens. It can be done more consciously and deliberately through faculty discussion, through administrative formulations, through policy and practice for hiring, etc.

Judgment requires openness. Judgment may reinforce prior beliefs. It may also call for change, for intellectual conversion, for what has been called *paradigmatic shift*. What is here at stake is both the objectivity of truth and the subjectivity of sincerity. When the two come together, Lonergan labels it *authenticity*. To

open oneself for the possibility of a paradigmatic shift, it is often necessary to move from where we are standing. When we take steps in some other direction, we change our horizons. This helps us to test prior judgments and to make fresh ones. New horizons may not always provide new answers, but they do very often pose new questions.

The final level of consciousness is *decision* leading to some kind of action. This is the final step of conversion, the concluding dimension of authenticity. Without decision, we are playing with words and ideas. With decision, we are placing our thinking at the service of life.

It is difficult to single out examples of decision in the context of Catholic high school, because decisions are so particular and so dependent upon the school, the situation, the personnel, the student body, the community, etc. They involve not only school policy, but also such practical matters as acceptance or rejection of students, hiring of faculty, amount of tuition and salaries, priorities in curriculum, etc. As we move into the following sections of this paper, practical implications for the four mindsets to be described will be suggested.

Four Complementary Mindsets

1. Creational

Late in the evening or early in the morning, a teacher corrects papers or prepares classes. He or she pushes to get the task done, but every so often a nagging question intrudes: Why? One response may come from a *creational* mindset: Kids are worth educating; teaching is worth my time and energy.

The mindset *creational* parallels the opening chapters of the Book of Genesis. It is optimistic: all that God makes is good. It is realistic: we work by the sweat of our brow and we return to the ground from which we were taken. From this mindset we make such affirmations as:

> The gift of being a human person is good.
> Becoming our best selves is worth the effort.
> Growth, though natural, takes care and discipline.
> Something of who we are and what we do lasts.
> Grace builds upon nature.

This mindset has its own set of symbols through which teachers image what they are doing in Catholic secondary schools. The images come with emotions. Some are: awe at natural beauty and wonder at life, especially young life; pride in achievement and

in response to challenge; joy in sharing one's own hard-won knowledge.

About a quarter of a century ago, youth minister Pierre Babin coined the word *naturalité* (in English, *naturation*) to describe how adolescents find God especially in the wonders of creation and in present experience more than in historical revelation. I have found this to be true not only for adolescents but also for their teachers. Naturation is one example of the *creational* mindset.

Organizing and explaining concrete images are abstract models. Two in particular strike me as helpful here. They are:

a. The psychosocial tasks which psychologist Erik Erikson describes in his epigenetic cycle for personal development: trust, autonomy, initiative, industry, identity, intimacy, generativity, integrity. They are all operative throughout our lives, even though at a given stage one or more may be in the ascendancy.[4] The school is one of the places where persons engage in these tasks and hopefully resolve them in a positive manner. I see this way of thinking underlying the way teachers in the survey ranked the characteristics which Catholic schools should emphasize (e.g., mastery of reading, writing, and mathematics skills; a healthy self-concept; critical thinking skills; intellectual curiosity).[5]

b. An understanding of creation which stresses the unity rather than the duality between this world and the next, between here and hereafter, between natural and supernatural. This model came to the fore toward the close of the Second Vatican Council and found its expression especially in *The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*. More recently it underlies much of the thinking in the pastoral letters of the United States bishops on peace and on the economy. The survey illustrates how operative this model is (and also how nuanced) by way of its item on God's relationship to the world.[6]

In working from this mindset, what is most at issue? What questions arise to probe and challenge it? Sometimes it says too little; sometimes it says too much.

The *creational* mindset says too little when it lessens or omits faith in God as creator and belief in Jesus as incarnate Word. The climate of the school risks becoming more humanistic, even secular, than an environment which witnesses explicitly to a faith-tradition, that of Catholic Christianity. The study *Sharing the Faith* gives some grounds for such a tendency. The vocabulary of lay teachers, both Catholic and non-Catholic, tends to be more professional than ministerial, more humanistic than religious, when compared with that of vowed religious and clergy in the schools.[7] As the schools are staffed more and more by laypersons, the

creational mindset is likely to become more dominant. This perhaps is the major issue raised by the study.

The *creational* mindset may also say too much. It may betray a certain naivete about human nature. True, it does take into account the frailty of our human situation, yet it tends to emphasize human goodness and perfectibility. Interestingly enough, according to the data in the study just cited, the religious and clergy are the ones more positive about human nature than are the laypersons.[8] As the number of religious decreases even further, this also will affect the basic climate of the school.

We have to keep asking and trying to answer such questions as the following:

In our desire for professional excellence, have we made the *creational* mindset into such a dominant paradigm that we are neglecting other models which articulate what a Catholic high school should be all about? Have our efforts to match and even surpass other agencies of secondary education been at the price of the special identity of Catholic schools?

Or at the other extreme, have we at times replaced educational goals and activity with religious language and practice? Have we viewed that school as an extension of the family or of the parish or of the wider church, as a locus for word and worship and Christian behavior, and not as a school?

Do we keep high our ideals for our schools as educational enterprises, all the while recognizing their shortcomings and the human frailty of ourselves and of our students?

May I make here two concluding recommendations, one more practical and one more theoretical.

The practical recommendation is that we continually reaffirm our faith in ourselves and in our students. Schools can easily become adversative rather than supportive environments. In respecting each other's professional turf, teachers may not share and encourage enough. Our relationship with our students may be one of continuous correction, both oral and written. In our teachers' room we may always be airing our complaints--therapeutically beneficial, perhaps, but educationally defeating.

The theoretical recommendation is that we try, with an incarnational faith, to infuse our professional efforts with a loving ministry in the name of Jesus Christ.

I have introduced here the word *incarnational*. How does it relate to the mindset *creational*? This section of the paper began with reference to the opening chapters of the Book of Genesis. These particular Scriptures come from a particular religious tradition, yet the kind of faith in God and creation which we find

in them can easily be owned by persons of other religious traditions. If we shift our attention to the opening section of the Gospel according to Saint John, we can note both the continuity and the discontinuity of Christian faith vis-a-vis that of Israel. In continuity, the Prologue affirms faith in the same creation which we find in Genesis. It provides grounds for our own belief "that it is good." It includes also the presence of frailty and sinfulness: the darkness in which the light shines.

The discontinuity comes, not as negation, but as transformation. The incarnation suffuses all. It respects the integrity of creation but it also gives it new meaning, especially where persons are concerned: "Of his fullness we have all had a share--love following upon love."

2. Covenantal

A family has two sons. The elder spends his spare time in college working with computers. Upon graduation an insurance firm hires him at a salary over $30,000. The younger spends his college spare time helping coach football and basketball at the Catholic high school he attended. Upon graduation the high school hires him as a teacher at a salary under $20,000. Without passing any judgment on the elder, we may say of the younger that he lives out of a *covenantal* mindset.

The following excerpt from *Sharing the Faith* captures something of the spirit of the *covenantal* mindset:

> The reasons teachers give for teaching in a Catholic high school are diverse. Overall, however, 85 percent describe their primary motivation in terms of their desire to teach in the unique educational environment of the Catholic high school and their understanding of teaching as ministry, descriptions that suggest a broadly shared perception of the Catholic high school as a special place, and Catholic high school teaching as something more than a job.[9]

With the mindset *covenantal* we move further into the Scriptures. In the Book of Exodus we read how God struck a pact or covenant with Israel. The mindset *covenantal* has dimensions such as these:

a bond among persons;
a relationship that transcends legal stipulations;
a destiny for individuals, for the group, and for the wider world of human persons.

Among Christians, especially in the United States, the biblical category *covenant* is more common in Protestant thought than Catholic. Covenant for Protestants is not an educational term, but an evangelical one. What value does it have for educators in Catholic high schools?

Its value is that it is one way of raising and to some extent resolving the tension between *covenantal* and *contractual* mindsets. And here we are entering onto a very sensitive minefield.

It is important that we unite these two mindsets before we distinguish them one from the other. If we separate them at the outset and set them one against the other, we may never get them back together again. The quality of covenant is faithful love; that of contract is justice. In the Scriptures, the two come together. As we read in the Book of Micah, after mention of human sacrifice: "No, the Lord has told us what is good. What the Lord requires of us is this: to do what is just, to show constant love, and to live in humble fellowship with our God." (6:8)

Yet we do have a problem. In part it comes from the history of Catholic education in the United States. The schools form an integral part of Catholic history in the United States unparalleled in any other Christian time or place. Whether built by parishes, by dioceses, or by religious communities, the schools relied almost entirely upon the freewill offerings of the Catholic faithful in general and upon the contributed services of the clergy and vowed religious in particular. It was a three-way covenant without contract among the Catholic people, the religious teachers, and God. In brief, all involved pledged themselves in an unspoken bond.

When laypersons joined the staff of Catholic schools (at first by way of exception), they too entered into this covenant. Even though laypersons were salaried differently from religious teachers, they shared in their poverty for the sake of a largely poor immigrant church.

Times have changed. Catholic schools are staffed by a three-quarter majority of laypersons. Religious communities and individual religious have more say over what ministry they perform and how they are recompensed for it. Aside from Hispanics and recent immigrants, Catholics now find themselves for the most part in middle and upper-middle class (e.g., non-hispanic Catholics average higher income than do Protestants).

Does the covenant still hold? Judging by the study on Catholic high school teachers which we have been citing, the covenant still holds. The motivations and aspirations of those surveyed betray a far more *covenantal* than *contractual* mindset.[10]

At the same time, there are more qualifications to the covenant. In the passage from Micah cited above, God rejects human sacrifice. To my knowledge Catholic schools have never torched a teacher on a sacrificial pyre, yet they have at times abused them through overwork and underpay. In a covenant we make ourselves very vulnerable. Thus there has been good reason to introduce and to continue to work for contractual modifications of our covenant.

It may clarify the *covenantal* mindset by suggesting how it may be exemplified on the four levels of consciousness which have been previously described in this paper.

On the level of experience, the following images may embody the covenantal mindset:

a. support from fellow teachers, especially in more difficult times;

b. a sense of meaning in and appreciation for one's work;

c. acceptance by students and parents for oneself;

d. more immediate covenantal parallels, such as friendship and marriage.

On the level of understanding, some models have been developed in other disciplines which can apply here.

a. Covenant in terms of personhood. Personal relationships can be a rhythm of self-communication and self-transcendence, as developed by theologian Karl Rahner.[11] To be a person is to be open to other persons. We are present to others by sharing ourselves outwardly in self-communication. In turn, the other person or persons, freely, may respond to having heard us. In doing so, he or she or they self-transcend, go out beyond themselves.

b. Covenant in terms of community. In *Community of Faith: Models and Strategies for Developing Christian Communities*, pastoral theologians E.E. and J.D. Whitehead give a new and helpful twist to the classic distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society). They create a continuum with *primary group* at one end and *formal organization* at the other. They maintain that church as community of faith moves back and forth somewhere in between the two.[12] Can the same be said of Catholic high schools?

c. Covenant in terms of commitment. The bestselling book *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*, by sociologists R. Bellah, R. Madsen, W. Sullivan, A. Swidler, and S. Tipton, analyzes two dominant forces in American life: individualism (concern for oneself) and commitment

(involvement in public service). It also provides a rich sociological vocabulary to help us reflect on where we came from, where we are at, and where we may be going.[13] Much of this vocabulary can be used in discussing Catholic high schools.

On the level of judgment, we face some probing questions.

How valuable is the *covenantal* mindset which inspired and sustained the Catholic high schools? Is it worth struggling and sacrificing for in these times as the make-up of the schools is changing?

How viable is this mindset? Will it continue to attract talented and dedicated personnel?

What model for our schools serves us best in our long-range planning which needs to be made in the light of data available to us?

On the level of decision, more practical but no less difficult questions arise:

How can we maintain the covenantal tradition of our schools without asking unfair sacrifices from our faculty members?

Can our schools be run on a more business-like basis (such as hospitals seem to be doing) without changing the spirit which has made Catholic schools unique?

What can be done so that Catholic high schools become living examples of the principles for social justice found in such church documents as the pastoral letter of the U.S. bishops on the U.S. economy?

Covenant: it is a good word. It is also a dangerous word. Do we want it as a mindset for describing what Catholic schools are or should be?

3. Discipleship

In the fall of 1986 the New York Mets won the World Series. Right after the game, the MVP of the Series, Mets third baseman Ray Knight, was interviewed on national television. He spoke first of the meaning of Jesus for him. In January of 1987 the New York Giants won the Superbowl. In the locker room after the victory, a reporter interviewed Giant defensive end George Martin. He began by expressing his gratitude for the place of Jesus in his life. These two athletes exemplify how explicit discipleship has become in the lives of many men and women of the twentieth century.

The mindset *discipleship* derives from the Christian Scriptures. In the last few years it has had a renewed popularity as a way of saying what it means to be both an individual Christian

and a Christian community of faith. Ecclesiologist Avery Dulles has written a good deal on models for understanding church. He shows a preference for the image of discipleship. In summary form he describes it in this way:

> The disciple is by definition one who has not yet arrived, a learner trying to comprehend strange words and unravel puzzling experiences. To be a disciple is to be under authority and correction. It is to be still on the way to full conversion and blessedness of life. In the Church today, that is what most of us feel ourselves to be.[14]

Appealing as the mindset *discipleship* may be to Christians, it raises some issues when used in an educational context. I would like to deal with three:

a. How do teachers think of themselves?
b. What is a school all about?
c. In what sense is discipleship countercultural?

The first issue is whether or not *discipleship* is the way teachers think of themselves when they are working with adolescents. As we have seen, according to the data in *Sharing the Faith*, religious teachers think of what they are doing in vocabulary such as *ministry*, while lay teachers for the most part do not. Lay teachers tend to identify themselves as professional educators. This does not mean that they cannot change. With the percentage of lay teachers increasing, however, this change is not likely unless a critical mass of persons think that *discipleship* is important and work very hard to keep it in the consciousness of the Catholic secondary school faculties.

More important than the problem of vocabulary is the issue of what a school is all about. To what extent can a school be structured for discipleship?

Compare our schools with the one Jesus ran, which clearly was for discipleship. Jesus did not wait for applicants. He personally picked out most of his students, often the most unlikely learners. Instead of classes and assignments, the disciples walked around with Jesus, saw how he helped people, heard what he taught, questioned him further in private, took trips with him, ate and celebrated with him.

The walking school of Jesus would hardly get accreditation today--it had problems enough in the first century, which was educationally so much less regulated than ours. Yet we can learn from it if we distinguish its underlying dynamics and its external structure. The structure has limited value for us today. The

dynamics, however, still apply. We find in Jesus' school explanation, questioning, clarification, illustration, etc., as may be found in a classroom. Above all, however, there was modeling. Through personal contact, the disciples tried on for size the lifestyle of this person who was so significant to them. They copied, and they grew into what they imitated.

A third issue has to do with being countercultural. Among other things, a secondary school is an agent of socialization into the values of the society in which it finds itself. It prepares young people to take a responsible role in that society. True, a good school helps question that society, examine it critically, and work for positive change. Yet we do not usually look upon a secondary school as a revolutionary agent.

Christian discipleship, on the other hand, is revolutionary. Hopefully it is not counterpersonal--quite the contrary--but it is countercultural. This applies not only to negative aspects of our culture, such as substance abuse and sexual license. It applies also to some positive dimensions which we usually encourage in our schools: developing one's talents to fulfill oneself; learning to love oneself even at the risk of a bit of narcissism; loyalty and love for one's friends, etc. Discipleship says more: developing one's talents to be at the service of others; willingness to give up self-interest, even legitimate self-interest, for the sake of another; loving not only one's friends but also one's enemies; etc.

Here we have to be careful not to set in opposition to one another humanistic and Christian values in education. Hopefully the *creational* mindset showed their correlation. At the same time we would not be faithful to the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the gospels if we simply equated humanistic and Christian values.

We have to be careful also not to expect from adolescents too much of what is beyond their stage of development in such areas as appreciation of cultures very different from their own, postconventional moral reasoning, altruistic and prosocial behavior, etc. A disciple, by definition, is one who is still learning.

Even with all these provisos and cautions, the Catholic school is not the place to hide the light of the gospel under a bushel.

At this moment of Catholic Christian history in the United States history, systemic questions are calling out for special attention. Two key examples recently have been nuclear weapons and the economy. The bishops of the United States have listened, consulted, discussed, reflected, prayed, and then spoke out. They have taken stands which, from a systemic point of view, are countercultural, such as seeing the condition of the poor as the

bottom-line criterion for judging how good an economic system is.[15]

The teachers in the survey did not score high in this area. As *Sharing the Faith* notes in "Major Findings":

> Concerns for social justice are not top priorities for many Catholic teachers. In terms of teachers' value hierarchies, social justice and peace goals tend toward the middle of a list of 22 life goals. Religious attach slightly more importance to these goals than other teachers. Catholic lay teachers give these the lowest ranks, with non-Catholics falling between.[16]

We can close this treatment of the *discipleship* mindset with these basic questions:

What do we mean when we say that a Catholic high school is a community of faith (i.e., of active disciples)?

How is a Catholic high school like a parish and how is it not?

What is distinctive about a *Christian* locus for *education*?

What does it mean for a Catholic high school to preach the word, to witness to the gospel, to advocate prophetically values and actions which may for some be countercultural?

A final word on *discipleship*: it is wise to recognize at the end of this section that the person and teaching of Jesus has always provoked conflicting reactions: admiration and imitation from some, derision and rejection from others. There is no reason to expect that the administration, teachers, and students in our schools today will react any differently.

4. Catholic Christianity

Picking a high school for one's son or daughter (or helping the child make the selection) can be difficult. What are the criteria and how strong is each one? Academic excellence? Ability of this son or daughter? Geographical convenience? Finances? Place where friends are? Differing traditions of schools? For some parents, the fact that the school is Catholic counts a good deal. They come to the decision with the mindset I am calling *Catholic Christianity*.

The fourth and final mindset, *Catholic Christianity*, takes us into and through Catholic history and tradition. It is difficult to label, because names we may choose, such as Catholic Church, Roman Catholic, Catholicism, Catholic faith-community, already

favor one way of nuancing this mindset. Hopefully *Catholic Christianity* is neutral enough.

Perhaps the language of socialization may help. When we socialize we initiate young persons into the values and beliefs of a group, a community, a culture. In Catholic American history, there have been three main agents of socialization for the young, which together form a triangle: the family, the parish, and the school. The first, widest, and most important angle has been and still is the family. The impact of the family on the religious affiliation of the young has changed, especially with the lessening influence of ethnic roots and of practices associated with religion. Many say that the influence of the family has been considerably weakened; perhaps it is more accurate to say that this influence is different, rather than more or less.

A second agent of socialization has been the parish. Its influence upon young people, in comparison with primary and secondary schools, is difficult to estimate. In some areas of the United States schools were built first, with Mass celebrated in halls and auditoria. In other areas the parish church came first, with schools later or not at all. Hopefully contemporary efforts at parish renewal are offering to young persons a stronger Catholic identity. The parish, however, is not the focus of our conference.

The school is the third angle in the socialization triangle. Advocates and critics alike recognize their enormous influence upon Catholic Christianity in the United States. Why not simply keep things going as they were? There are several factors at work which make this impossible, and each one raises questions and issues.

The first and most obvious has been the drop in enrollment in Catholic schools in the last twenty years. On the secondary level, even if numbers stabilize and stay constant, only 20% of Catholic adolescents will be attending Catholic high schools. That leaves four-fifths of our young people operating out of a two-angle socialization triangle.

A second factor at work is that vowed religious and clergy are less numerous and, it would seem, less influential in the schools than before. True, the laypersons involved have their own gifts to offer. Yet from *Sharing the Faith* it seems that laypersons are less concerned than clergy and religious about items which have more bearing upon socialization into Catholic Christianity: doctrine, moral teaching, hierarchical leadership. We read, for example:

> Lay faculty differ considerably from religious faculty in their commitment to and level of activity in the institutional church. We should not expect lay teachers to be bonded

> to the Church in quite the same way as priests, sisters, and brothers. But we should expect Catholic lay teachers to model and encourage the kind of involvement that builds and sustains the community of faith. The survey findings suggest that this kind of institutional commitment needs to be strengthened.[17]

A third factor is even more basic: our understanding of church today has been changing and is pluralistic. If we intend to socialize young people into Catholic Christianity, what kind of a church do we have in mind? Of the various models now being proposed theologically and pastorally, which one, or what combination of them, will be for us a practical paradigm?

If we stay on the level of cognitive model, a good deal of work has been done for us by theologians like Avery Dulles. In his *Models of the Church* he worked with five: institution, mystical communion, sacrament, herald, and servant.[18] Subsequently he developed the image/model of community of disciples as more pastoral and actual.[19] Most recently he has developed in an ecumenical way the relationship between the Catholic principle of mediation and the Protestant principle of criticism.[20] With models such as these as tools, individual teachers and school faculties can shape the understanding of church which they want to share with their students.

For many people, however, relationship with church has to do more with experiences, affections, childhood and family memories than with cognitive models. The church is warmth and acceptance, or awe and reverence, or rules and regulations, or heroes and heroines. It comforts and it challenges. It heals and it hallows. It links with one's past and leads into one's future. It is outside in some respects and inside in others. It gives a simple answer to items on questionnaires about one's religious affiliation: "Catholic."

Here we have to recognize a great and unresolved conflict that goes far beyond the question of the Catholic identity of a high school. As Catholics we have been used to people identifying themselves with the totality of a tradition to express their religious identity. A person bought the whole package, even though he or she may not like or even pay attention to every item in it. Today the selectivity seems to come first, like a shopper going up and down the aisles of a supermarket, picking up an item here, an item there, before putting it all together in a bag at the check-out counter. I don't intend this supermarket image to be judgmental, but descriptive. *Sharing the Faith* indicates that it is becoming

more and more prevalent among teachers in Catholic high schools,[21] even though these teachers score higher than the general Catholic population with regard to religious commitment. We read:

> One important conclusion is that Catholic high schools tend to attract religiously-motivated teachers, at least in comparison to the Catholic population in general. To a much greater degree than the average American Catholic, the teacher in the Catholic high school is a believer, a churchgoer, and a person who prays.[22]

In practice, a school has to respond to a most basic question: To what extent is Catholic Christianity intrinsic to our identity as a high school? To be authentic educators, we have to go beneath the rhetoric of mottoes and logos.

If we decide to feature Catholic identity, then practical steps will suggest themselves. For example:

faculty colloquia with a Catholic Christian dimension;

prayer, worship, retreat opportunities for students in which faculty and staff can in some way participate;

support for a campus ministry office;

hiring practices which in some way involve the mindset *Catholic Christianity*.

Conclusion

There is an expression which has become common in recent times. When someone is considering a course of action, has researched it and asked others about it, but is pausing before actually setting the plan in motion, friends will say to him or her: "Go for it!"

At the close of our conference in March, it would be fine if we could have a concrete plan of action for which our friends would say to us: "Go for it!" But go for what? My hope is that the four mindsets discussed in this paper, *creational*, *covenantal*, *discipleship*, and *Catholic Christianity*, may help us decide what in theory and in practice we should be going for.

As a conclusion for this paper, first of all I would suggest an evaluation of these mindsets. I would like to rely upon the following three criteria for adequacy which are found in recent theological literature:[23]

a. Does the theory have meaning, that is, is it internally coherent? Do all the parts fit together logically?

b. Is the theory meaningful, that is, does it make a difference in the lives of those who assent to it?

c. Is the theory true, that is, does it correlate with the objective data which come from experience?

1. CREATIONAL

a. The *creational* mindset has internal coherence. It makes sense in its affirmations about the intrinsic goodness and capabilities of the human person. For persons of Christian faith, it provides a good foundation for the mystery of the incarnation. Its one internal problem is that for many it does not need Christian faith, or even faith in God. It can hold its own as a secular humanism.

b. This mindset is especially meaningful for professional educators. It expresses for many why they entered the teaching profession and why they remain within it. It is ranked as less significant by those teachers who build their lives more directly upon faith in God and in Jesus Christ.

c. Some evidence from experience supports this mindset: the beauty of creation, the achievements of human persons, the goodness and idealism toward which men, women, and young people constantly reach out. Some evidence challenges this mindset: ugliness in the world, the presence of evil, and the mystery of death. Belief in a transcendent God and some form of human immortality helps resolve this conflict and tension.

2. COVENANTAL

a. The *covenantal* mindset has inner coherence. It relies upon the interpersonal dynamics of speaking and hearing, of asking and responding, of trusting and committing. It has difficulty, however, in including within itself less interpersonal values which are achieved by bargaining and confrontation.

b. This mindset is meaningful in what it says. As the data reveal, the teachers are person-oriented. Fidelity and compassion make a big difference. It is not meaningful when it provides no protection against the vulnerability persons may experience in covenantal environments.

c. Again, the evidence is for and against. On the one hand, Catholic schools have been built upon relationships which have enriched those involved: faculty, staff, and students. People have become their better selves through self-transcending commitment and dedication. On the other hand, people have been hurt. They, their families, and their communities have been pressured to make sacrifices which have not been just.

3. DISCIPLESHIP

a. The *discipleship* mindset is coherent within itself. The deeds and sayings of Jesus hold together as a way of life which is intelligible and unified. It has one intrinsic difficulty: its prophetic rhetoric. Jesus preached dramatic challenges, as when he urged his followers to turn the other cheek when struck or to mutilate themselves rather than cause someone to sin. His followers are to take such commands seriously, but not always literally.

b. *Discipleship* makes a large difference for the religious surveyed. They have based their lives and ministry upon it. As for the lay teachers, this mindset is mixed. It is important, but not central. Or it makes more sense for their private than for their professional lives.

c. There is positive evidence that those with the mindset *discipleship* make excellent educators; the history of Christian education attests to this fact. This applies, however, more to the personal motivation of the teacher than to the curriculum or pedagogy of the school. An explicit curriculum on and pedagogy toward *discipleship* may be more at home in a parish RCIA or in novitiate training than in a school.

4. CATHOLIC CHRISTIANITY

a. *Catholic Christianity* as a mindset is interiorly coherent. From its first century beginnings to its present form, it has followed a kind of inner logic that helps all the parts fit together: doctrine, worship, morality. It has many inner tensions, especially today at a time of transition. It is more difficult to single out any and call them contradictions.

b. The teachers surveyed seemed less enthusiastic about this mindset than the other three. This was particularly true of lay teachers with regard to personal morality, but it included the religious as well. There was a surprisingly low concern for issues of social justice.

c. The evidence indicates, not a hostility, but an apathy with regard to Catholic Christianity, especially in its institutional expression. Perhaps many just take it for granted. It does not seem that the schools are promoting it as actively and energetically as did our forebears in Catholic secondary education.

With regard to these mindsets, I think that we should make a determined effort not to think disjunctively (setting them against one another) but to think conjunctively (weaving the better elements of each into a new whole). Yet choose we do, and probably for practical reasons choose we must. We emphasize, we prioritize, we act according to some mindsets more than others.

Thus, finally, I would like to rank the four mindsets which this paper has been dealing with. In *Habits of the Heart*, its authors have this to say about *language*:

> We use the term to refer to modes of moral discourse that include distinct vocabularies and characteristic patterns of moral reasoning. We use *first language* to refer to the individualistic mode that is the dominant American form of discourse about moral, social, and political matters. We use the term *second languages* to refer to other forms, primarily biblical and republican, that provide at least part of the moral discourse of most Americans.[24]

I would like to borrow upon their method. If we substitute *mindset* for what they call *language* and *Catholic secondary education* for what they call *patterns of moral reasoning*, I would make this ranking for what we are *actually* doing:

first mindset: *creational*
second mindsets (in order of priority):
covenantal
discipleship
Catholic Christianity

May I go a step beyond reporting. My own suggestion for what our mindset priorities for Catholic secondary education *should* be are:

primary mindset: *creational*
secondary mindsets (in order of priority):
discipleship
covenantal
Catholic Christianity

These priorities need justification. I put *creational* as primary mindset, not because it is the most important approach to life, but because of what I understand a school to be as distinguished from a parish or a house of prayer. A school is primarily a locus for young people to grow as thinking human persons.

Among the secondary mindsets, I ranked *discipleship* first because I think we find the other two within it. *Discipleship* personalizes our *covenant*. It articulates it into compelling motivation. It gives to it flesh and blood. As we read again and again in the Christian Scriptures, the new covenant is in, through, and with a person.

Why does *Catholic Christianity* end up last? We have here a chicken-and-egg dilemma: Do we find Jesus through the church or

do we come to the church through Jesus? At this time in our history, with such ambivalence and ambiguity about church, I think that the second is more common: the kind of church we want to be comes about through shared discipleship with Jesus Christ. The other way around brings with it too much baggage.

What then do I think we should "go for"?

for excellence in education from a *creational* mindset
motivated by the self-transcending love of a *discipleship* mindset
with care for persons in a *covenantal* mindset
as members of a faith-community within the *Catholic Christian* mindset.

This important question about mindsets for Catholic high schools can be viewed as one example of a larger issue which has been much debated in recent years: the relationship between evangelization (proclaiming the good news of Jesus Christ) and humanization (protecting life and improving the quality of life of all persons on this planet). The tension involved has not as yet been resolved. One suggested solution in church documents has been to say: *the church humanizes by evangelizing*. This is true, but so is its counterpart: *the church evangelizes by humanizing*.

Applying this tension to education, we can say either *the church educates through disciplizing* or *the church disciplizes through educating*. The concluding suggestion of this paper is that, as far as Catholic secondary education is concerned, we begin with and emphasize the latter: excellence in education. But we suffuse our efforts with our shared faith in Jesus of Nazareth.

Endnotes

[1]G. Konopka, "Requirements for Healthy Development of Adolescent Youth," *Adolescence*, vol. 8 (fall 1973), p. 296.

[2]B. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, New York: The Seabury Press, 1972, pp. 14-15 and passim.

[3]A. Greeley, *The Religious Imagination*, New York: W. H. Sadlier, 1981, pp. 1-20.

[4]E. Erikson, *Identity: Youth and Crisis*, New York: Norton, 1968, p. 94 and passim.

[5]P. Benson and M. Guerra, *Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers*, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1985, p. 47; henceforth *Sharing the Faith.*

[6]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[7]Ibid., pp. 16-17.

[8]Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[9]Ibid., p. 17.

[10]Ibid., p. 17 and passim.

[11]K. Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*, New York: Crossroad, 1978, passim.

[12]J. Whitehead and E. Whitehead, *Community of Faith: Models and Strategies for Developing Christian Communities*, New York: Seabury, 1982, pp. 26-46 and passim.

[13]R. Bellah, R. Madsen, W. Sullivan, A. Swidler, and S. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*, New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

[14]A. Dulles, *A Church To Believe In: Discipleship and the Dynamics of Freedom*, New York: Crossroad, 1982, p. 10.

[15]U.S. Bishops' Pastoral Message and Letter, *Economic Justice for All: Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy*, #24.

[16]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 7.

[17]Ibid., p. 60.

[18]A. Dulles, *Models of the Church*, New York: Doubleday, 1974.

[19]A. Dulles, *A Church To Believe In*, New York: Crossroad, 1982.

[20]A. Dulles, *The Catholicity of the Church*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

[21]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 35.

[22]Ibid., p. 28.

[23]Cf., for example, D. Tracy, *Blessed Rage for Order: The New Pluralism in Theology*, New York: The Seabury Press, 1978, pp. 64-71.

[24]R. Bellah et al., *op. cit.*, p. 334.

THE SELF-UNDERSTANDING OF CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Zeni Fox, Ph.D.

Dr. Fox is the director of the lay ministry program at Immaculate Conception Seminary, Seton Hall University, where she teaches in the areas of pastoral theology and youth ministry. She has served as a consultant and instructor with the Center for Youth Ministry Development and teaches in the Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education at Fordham University. Her past experience includes teaching in a Catholic high school and serving as coordinator of youth ministry in the Archdiocese of New York.

Introduction

> Our life story is a story of human relationships. So it is reasonable to expect that our religious story will be heavily influenced by human relationships. Nature plays a role in the development of the religious imagination, as do "direct" experiences of God. However, the principal "sacraments" by which loving goodness is revealed to us are other human beings.[1]

The image of persons as sacraments is used in a report on a study of Catholic teenagers and young adults in order to emphasize the centrality of interpersonal relationships in communicating the faith.

This study, as so many others, found that family relationships have a powerful influence on religious formation. In the context of religious education, whether in Catholic school or CCD, the classroom itself was not found to be central, nor even the number of years spent studying. Rather, the most important factor was "the nature of the instructional relationship between teacher and student."[2] Teachers *are* (or, at the very least, can be) sacraments by which God's loving goodness is revealed. Therefore, it is of great importance to reflect on the teachers in our Catholic high schools, and their understanding of their role in relation to their students and the Church.

The study we are exploring, *Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers*, provides a wealth of data which can assist in developing a fuller understanding of these teachers. It also provides reflective analysis of the findings, and

recommendations based on the study. In this paper, I will work primarily with the data presented. My purpose will be to probe the self understanding these teachers have of their work, in relation to the mission and ministry of the Church, and in relation to the formation of their students in Christian beliefs and values. I will reflect on their understanding in the light of other knowledge and present some ideas for response to their analysis.

I. Self Understanding of Their Work in Relation to the Mission and Ministry of the Church

The authors of this study titled it *Sharing the Faith*. I hear in that title an echo of the name for the National Catechetical Directory. I presume that it defines an expectation on the part of the authors of the study of what a Catholic high school should be doing. Do the teachers share this perspective?

The data on the reasons teachers give for teaching in Catholic high schools gives help in trying to answer this question. Catholic lay teachers rank order their reasons as follows: desire to teach in this kind of educational environment, love of teaching, view of teaching as ministry, God's choice for my life, and opportunity to witness to my faith. In their analysis, Benson and Guerra label the first two reasons as educational, the next three as religious. It is significant that of eleven choices, for the Catholic lay teachers these are the first five. The experiential and practical reasons are of lower rank.[3]

On the other hand, religious rank religious reasons as their first three choices, and the educational reasons fourth and fifth. Like the Catholic laity, the non-Catholic teachers give educational reasons highest priority, but rank practical reasons (only teaching position available to me, and means of gaining experience for future opportunities) third and fourth. Their fifth reason is God's choice for my life. Among the eleven choices, the only other one designated in the analysis as religious is opportunity to be part of a faith community. Catholic laity and non-Catholics rank this seventh, religious rank it sixth.[4]

One way of interpreting this data is to say that while for the religious the primary purpose of the school is sharing the faith, for the Catholic laity and, to a greater extent, the non-Catholic teachers, this purpose is secondary. Several factors may be influencing these perspectives.

Ministry

A first issue to consider is the word ministry itself. In Catholic circles, this is a new word. That fact is surprising to many, because the word is used so extensively today that it almost seems to have been always so. Before 1972, there are no references to ministry in Catholic literature--except in the context of Protestant ministers or ministry. Within a few years, however, references multiply to an amazing degree, from the early campus and prison ministries, to youth ministry, to a broad range of works in the church described in this way.[5] In 1981, John Coleman, a Jesuit sociologist, wrote a perceptive article, noting that not only had the word come to be widely used with "Catholic circles of religious professionals," but also that rarely is the word defined. He observed:

> . . . [I]t is just those things that are taken for granted, undefined and unreflected on that constitute a culture in possession. What we do not need to define itself defines our world and charts our view of reality. It is our prevailing ideology, our map of expectations.[6]

Coleman alerts us to two factors to examine regarding the use of the word ministry in Catholic circles today. First, it has been claimed by "religious professionals." He includes here religious women, the new lay ministers and professional theologians. In my experience, this analysis is accurate--and Catholic lay teachers have not tended to embrace this word as spontaneously as these other groups.

Second, the word is generally not defined. In fact, it is used in varying ways, suggesting varying implicit definitions. Sometimes it is understood as a function of all baptized persons, sometimes as that of those officially designated (and the understanding of what is "official" also varies widely) by the Church. More recently, there is emphasis on ministry in the world, or the market place--but while bishops and national offices use the word this way, most lay people do not. In my evaluation, both the survey respondents and the authors of the study are using the term in a within-the-Church context, not as ministry to the world, and see the ministry of the Catholic school teacher as something more than that which is the task of all the baptized.

Laity and Ministry

This raises a question for me: Is it desirable that lay teachers view their work as a specialized ministry? And, if the

answer is yes, is this a ministry to the Church or a ministry to the world?

The preparatory document for the 1987 Synod, "The Mission of the Laity in the Church and in the World," ponders the tension that arises when we speak of the ministry of the laity.

> The nature of the laity is defined by their baptism and by their secular state. They live in the world and engage in temporal affairs. . . . Because of their secular condition, the laity have a proper mission not only in the church but also in the structures of the world. The distinctive task of the laity is the renewal of the temporal order.[7]

While the document clearly affirms a ministry of the laity within the Church, when called by the hierarchy, the emphasis is placed on their ministry to the world.

Central to an understanding of this ministry to the world is the teaching of Vatican II, in the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*. A dominant image in the constitution is that of dialogue between Church and world. One aspect of that dialogue is a willingness to allow the world to be the world. For instance, we read,

> If by the autonomy of earthly affairs we mean that created things and societies themselves enjoy their own laws and values which must be gradually deciphered, put to use, and regulated by men, then it is entirely right to demand that autonomy. . . . [A]ll things are endowed with their own stability, truth, goodness, proper laws, and order. Man must respect them. . .[8]

We have, therefore, a focus on laity as secular, and on the world as world. While the laity are enjoined to renew the temporal order, they are not simply to strive to make the Church co-extensive with the world. Laity serve the good of the world, in the world. What might this mean when we evaluate the purpose of the Catholic school?

Evangelical and Diaconal Ministry

I view the ministry of the school as twofold. On the one hand, a purpose of the school is evangelical: the proclaiming of the Gospel, and catechesis about its meaning in the lives of the students. In their pastoral letter on Catholic education, when

speaking of Catholic schools, the American Bishops quote the council: "Christian education is intended to 'make men's faith become living, conscious, and active, through the light of instruction.'"[9] In their words we hear the ecclesial purpose of Catholic education: to share the faith. This is the emphasis which I think probably informs choice of "view of teaching as ministry" when reasons for teaching in Catholic high schools were ranked by the teachers. Religious ranked this first, Catholic laity third.

It could reasonably be argued that when the Catholic school system in this country was begun, sharing the faith was the primary purpose of the schools. Immigrant clergy and parents experienced the public schools as fostering adherence to Protestant traditions, with customs like school prayer and Bible reading, and a general climate perceived as anti-Catholic. In order to share the *Catholic* faith, "our own" schools were needed. Furthermore, this evangelical role of the school was seen in the context of the work of the Church as evangelizer, and catechizer. We have long valued our dogmatic tradition, and have been at pains to share our belief system with our children and youth. The Baltimore catechism (or, rather, the catechisms of increasing grade-level complexity which bore that name) is but one evidence of that concern. Ultimately, this evangelical task derives from the Scriptural mandate, "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations . . . teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you" (Matthew 28:19-20). It has generally been seen as an important task of the Church, as the history of missionary efforts, as well as Catholic schools, clearly attests.

However, I think that a second purpose of the school can also be discerned. I have named this purpose diaconal, in order to capture its scriptural roots. Here, the purpose of the school is the service of human need. Two examples outside of the school context, both of which indicate that in their ministry the service of human need is primary, will help to explain what I mean. The first is that of Catholic hospitals. In Europe, the first hospitals were begun by religious orders; in the United States today, there are many Catholic hospitals. The hospitals are understood as existing to serve human need, the need of the sick. We do not expect hospitals to directly evangelize. The second example is Father Bruce Ritter's Covenant Houses. They exist to help teens escape the life of the streets. They serve the teens' human need for shelter, protection, education. Ritter clearly states that his staff should not directly evangelize. Both of these endeavors are supported as the work of the Church, because a ministry of the Church is the service of human need, or diaconal ministry.

The diaconal purpose of the school is education, understood as a basic, human good. A secular good, if you will. A good which belongs to the temporal order. And education has its own laws and values, determined by the field of education and its researchers, theorists and practitioners. In educational circles, emphasis is placed on service of the student, and of the discipline. Education is placed in counter-distinction to indoctrination, and educators tend to stress the need to assist students to freely choose value and belief systems. Each discipline proceeds according to a particular methodology of inquiry, and secondary school teachers trained in various disciplines seek to adhere to the methodology appropriate to their subject. I think that these ideas from the educational field seem to be informing the perspective of the lay teachers, both Catholic and non-Catholic, when they emphasize educational reasons for choosing to teach in a Catholic school.

Responses to the question of how much emphasis schools should place on developing various characteristics in their students give further evidence of these two understandings. Ninety-six percent of the religious indicate that a vibrant, mature religious faith should receive major emphasis, thereby ranking this first. Sixty-seven percent of Catholic lay teachers, and 54% of the non-Catholics, say this should be a major emphasis, yielding a rank of sixth and ninth, respectively. On the other hand, 90% of Catholic laity and 95% of non-Catholics gave major emphasis to mastery of reading, writing, and mathematics skills, the first ranked characteristic for both groups. Religious ranked this fifth. Similarly, 86% of religious, 57% of Catholic laity and 49% of non-Catholics gave a major emphasis to a personal commitment to Jesus, placing it in fourth, ninth and twelfth order of importance, respectively. For the laity, critical thinking skills and intellectual curiosity were ranked third and fourth, for the religious, sixth and seventh.[10] Again in these profiles, support for two different ways of understanding the mission of the school can be discerned. Religious emphasize the evangelical, laity the diaconal purpose of the school.

Evangelical or Diaconal Ministry?

I think that, at the present time, both of these goals of ministry are informing the work of the schools. Perhaps the diaconal dimension is not as well articulated in official documents, but various decisions made by school leaders suggest that this may be influencing their understanding. For example, 14% of teachers in Catholic high schools are non-Catholic.[11] A school which is

trying to serve human needs can easily unite with persons of good will who share that desire. Those needs can be served whether the recipients of the service are Catholic or not. In fact, there will be special efforts to serve those most in need--as the commitment of Catholic school educators to inner city schools demonstrates.

Perhaps the precisely diaconal ministry is that which is struggling for articulation as our Catholic schools adapt to meet the needs of a Catholic population that is now part of mainstream American life. In the closed Catholic communities of the past, having non-Catholics in our schools was practically unthinkable. But as we become more aware of our role to serve the world, to be a leaven in all of society, our schools have changed. And perhaps it will be the Catholic lay teachers who will be best able to articulate this understanding of the ministry of the school.

Furthermore, this diaconal ministry is expressed most cogently in secular terms, in the language of education and, at times, social service. That is the language of the world, of temporal affairs, of that very arena in which the students of the school now live, and in which most will live and work in the future. Like the students, the teachers, Catholic and non-Catholic, live in the world, and, to the extent that the school is not the Church, they also work in the world. In the persons of the teachers, the students experience one meaning of Catholic Christian faith--the living of a life of service to others. The diaconal ministry of the teachers is also evangelical.

Practical Implications

Sharing the Faith concludes with recommendations for the schools. One of these is: clarifying what schools intend to accomplish.[12] While acknowledging that the evangelical and diaconal ministries are not distinct, it is possible to focus on each individually, and to explore ways in which the schools meet each goal. I believe that the diaconal ministry may have particular relevance for non-Catholic teachers, and for Catholic teachers whose institutional affiliation may be weak. However, I think it is valuable to explore this aspect of the school's ministry with all teachers. One dimension of spiritual development is increased ability to name the religious experience present in one's everyday life. Assisting teachers to place their desire to serve their students within the context of ministry may add a conscious religious dimension to an already present but inchoate religious motivation.

The importance of such an effort is highlighted by the analysis offered in the recently published *Habits of the Heart*. This

philosophical-sociological study explores American culture, using the two polarities of individualism and commitment. The authors maintain that most Americans share a common moral vocabulary, a "first language" of individualism. Despite their capacity to actively care for others, the "second language" of commitment, which in the past has included the language of religion, often is not available to them as a way of explaining to themselves or to others *why* they are committed. The authors maintain that while in the past the understandings which both languages gave to us shaped the society, today the second language is too often lost. The danger is that, without this second language, as a society we cannot define adequately such essential things as the meaning of freedom and the requirements of justice.[13] In other words, the language of religion, or at least some other system committed to transcendent values, is needed in order to explain the very commitment to education which the teachers articulate.

Therefore, in planning workshops, seminars and spiritual development opportunities for Catholic high-school teachers, I think that the starting point should be the teachers themselves, their commitment and dedication to education, to their students, to their discipline. An exploration of their diaconal ministry, valued for its own sake as service of others, would provide a context for exploring the evangelical ministry of the school.

II. A Diversion: Developmental Issues

In this paper, I am probing the self-understanding of the teachers as it is revealed in the study. However, there is a factor influencing their understanding which is worth reflecting on, the effect of the age of the respondents on the findings. For simplicity, I will work with the data about Catholic lay teachers and religious, only. Forty-eight percent, or almost half, of the lay teachers are under 35; 87% of the religious are over 35, and 63% 45 or older.[14] Developmentally, virtually half of the lay teachers are young adults; only a small group of the religious are such, and most of the religious are past mid-life.

Research on young adults suggests that many experience a period of disaffection with institutional religion. One way that this is manifested is through their non-involvement in church activities, including worship. However, the institutional disaffiliation does not always manifest a spiritual malaise.[15] So, for example, in reflecting on the data presented in *Sharing the Faith*, I note that among Catholic lay teachers, 72% attend church services weekly, as do 35% of non-Catholics.[16] But 83% of Catholic laity, and 65% of the

non-Catholics report that they pray several times a week or more.[17] Furthermore, I note that 31% of lay teachers are integrated, moderately committed religionists. I question whether institutional disaffection influences the moderate degree of commitment.[18] These considerations suggest that efforts at providing teachers with opportunities for spiritual growth, as recommended by the study, must be undertaken with awareness of sociological factors which influence readiness in this area.

Another developmental issue arises in relation to the data on the belief scales created for the study, using responses to multiple items from the questionnaire. The researchers report that on each of the eleven scales, religious faculty attain the highest average, non-Catholics the lowest, and that Catholic lay teachers fall in the middle. They also indicate that teachers over age 45 score significantly higher than those under 45.[19]

The research of James Fowler on faith development causes me to wonder: Is this finding better understood when viewed from the perspective of his work? He posits that at stage 4, the stage of many adults under 40, there is a tendency to favor one of the poles in the paradoxical-pairs that comprise so much of our doctrinal formulations. (For example, the paradox of God's providence and our free will, or that of the role of authority and the place of conscience.) He sees in this way of appropriating faith a certain dichotomizing, an either/or logic. The person does not necessarily reject one side of an issue, but rather does not actively embrace it in his or her faithing activity. At stage 5, a stage seldom achieved before mid-life, individuals reclaim the neglected dimensions of faith, holding the paradoxical aspect in active tension. Fowler once called this stage paradoxical, to suggest the way in which the person sees both sides of an issue simultaneously. It is the stage at which the person tries to unify opposites.[20] This is why I suspect that persons who score high on such opposite scales as comforting religion and challenging religion, and agentic religion and communal religion, may be reflecting characteristics found at stage 5--and, therefore, are almost necessarily, over 45. While this can only be stated tentatively, it does again suggest that developmental factors be considered when planning response to the findings in this study.

Other findings in the study that can be reflected upon in light of developmental issues include the attitudes toward moral issues, both personal morality and social morality. The researchers report that age has a significant influence on the degree of support given for traditional Catholic teachings.[21] In Fowler's analysis, stage 4 persons place a greater emphasis on their personal judgment

in matters of faith, rather than on authority. This again shows the tendency to dichotomize which is characteristic of those at this developmental stage. At stage 5, personal judgment and teaching authority are held in paradoxical tension; the voice of authority is more fully heard.[22]

The researchers find that concerns for social justice are not top priorities for many Catholic teachers. Rated particularly low as a life goal was, to help change American economic policies which oppress people in other countries.[23] Once again, Fowler's theory may be instructive here. He holds that as faith develops from stage to stage, the bounds of social awareness expand. It is not until stage 5 that active awareness extends beyond the norms and interests of an individual's own class.[24] In my interpretation of this, for the most part those who make changing the status quo in our country, for the sake of serving the good of those who are not "like us," a primary goal for their lives are generally at Fowler's stage 5 of faith development. Therefore, I think that even extensive educational efforts based, for example, on the American Bishops' economics pastoral, are unlikely to lead people to embrace as a life-goal helping to change American economic policies which oppress people in other countries. Developmental factors influence such an agenda.

I subscribe to the Thomistic dictum, grace builds on nature. Therefore, I think that reflecting on studies about the faith of young adults, and on the process of faith development, is essential before planning workshops and seminars designed to influence teachers' understandings of their work in relation to the mission and ministry of the church.

III. Self-Understanding of Their Role in Helping Students Develop Christian Belief and Values

The authors of *Sharing the Faith* maintain (and, I think, rightly) that "schools have a critical mass of lay teachers for whom faith is meaningful and important, and who can make important positive contributions to the religious formation of students. . ."[25] And yet, when examining the characteristics which teachers think a Catholic high school should strive to develop in students, some data which at first glance seems to contradict this is reported. Some of this data was explored above, in part one: Catholic laity and non-Catholics place emphasis on broad educational goals, whereas religious see a vibrant, mature religious faith as the most important characteristic to develop. However, other aspects of their perceptions in this area bear further analysis.

A Psychological Orientation

All three groups of teachers in the study name the same characteristic as the second most important to emphasize: a healthy self-concept. Furthermore, in each case, about 90% of those surveyed say that this should receive major emphasis. The authors of the study see this as an affective dimension of religious formation,[26] but I question that interpretation. The understanding of the importance of a healthy self-concept comes to us from the field of psychology. The same idea is echoed, I think, in the teachers' assessment of life goals which are important for themselves: non-Catholics place to feel good about myself first, Catholic laity place it third, and religious, fifth, of the twenty-two proffered in the study.

I think that this pattern is in accord with the [illegible]ment offered by Bellah, et al., in *Habits of the Heart*. In de[illegible]four representative characters who embody the American eth[illegible] present the therapist as one. For the therapist (as for the manager) the center of life "is the autonomous individual, presumed able to choose the roles he will play and the commitments he will make, not on the basis of higher truths but according to the criterion of life-effectiveness as the individual judges it."[27] Furthermore, this character, born of American individualism, is unable to articulate reasons for working on behalf of the common good--especially when that good is larger than the interpersonal, when it is societal good. So we note that Catholic lay teachers rank the following goals particularly low: 16th, to help promote economic and social justice; 17th, to spend time helping people who are less fortunate than I am; 19th, to help promote world peace; 21st, to help change American economic policies which oppress people in other countries.[28] These rankings seem to further indicate an orientation shaped by cultural forces, an orientation toward the psychological, toward individualism, and consequently an orientation which does not grasp the centrality of work for social justice. Any educational efforts designed to deepen teachers' understandings of the church's social teaching will have to take these factors into consideration.

A Praxis Orientation

The authors of the study note that compassion and tolerance are two of the three characteristics which schools should emphasize that receive the widest support among the teachers. While they categorize these as affective dimensions of faith, I see them as behavioral dimensions, as ways in which one lives one's faith in

daily actions. Another dimension of faith, the cognitive, receives considerably less emphasis in the rankings of all three groups of teachers. For example, knowledge of Catholic doctrine is ranked lOth by Catholic layteachers, 12th by religious and 16th by non-Catholics, and a clear understanding of the Bible is ranked 15th, 13th and 12th by these groups, respectively.[29] Furthermore, when asked which aspects of religious formation they were interested in learning about, Catholic lay teachers and non-Catholics rated continuing education opportunities in theology or religious studies last of the eleven possibilities presented.[30] The cognitive dimension of faith is not highly valued.

I think that such as assessment by the teachers is reflective of a broad pattern in the American church. Recently I polled various religious educators about what they viewed as important developments in the field. RENEW was frequently mentioned as the most helpful and/or most successful adult education program *and* as an example of the kinds of processes needed in religious education in general. An extensive study of RENEW was conducted by sociologist James Kelly. He describes and evaluates various aspects of the program; in his conclusion, he draws on sociologist Emile Durkheim's concept of anomie. Kelly says that "we 'have' anomie when our old worlds of meaning are gone and we can't imagine new ones," and sees this as characteristic of this post-Vatican II time. Furthermore, in such a time of transition, in order to maintain the notion of the holy, movements to revitalize the tradition "plausibly require a moratorium on institutional dilemmas." Therefore, they seek "to anchor religious identity in religious affections which do not depend on creedal clarity and intellectualized faith."[31]

I would conclude that for the teachers studied, as for American Catholics in general, orthodoxy and creedal clarity are not of primary concern; but orthopraxis is more highly valued. This, too, should be considered when planning spiritual formation opportunities for teachers.

The Imaginal

Apparently, when categorizing the characteristics which schools should emphasize into 12 religious education and five other ones, the authors of the study did not consider aesthetic appreciation as an aspect of religious education. Furthermore, the teachers themselves did not consider this characteristic of central importance educationally, because Catholic laity and religious ranked it last, and non-Catholics, 15th, of seventeen choices.[32] In

light of the centrality of the imagination, as understood today by religious educators, and many other commentators,[33] this is a surprising fact.

Contemporary theological exploration of the role of the imagination in religious experience reminds us that we know God only through the concrete realities of life. Our experience of the divine is always mediated, sacramentally, both in the sense of the seven sacraments, and in the broader sense of the sacramentality of creation, including human persons, and especially Jesus. Neither our senses nor our abstract intellect perceive the mystery within. Rather,

> The imagination opens us to this experience of the Ultimate coming through finite reality, to the Depth at the heart of matter. For it is the imagination which knows the concrete in terms of its pervasive mystery.[34]

Furthermore, moral vision is rooted in the imagination. Because the imagination is the foundation of ordinary perception, the image that we already have of the world shapes the world that we will see--and, therefore, our actions in response to that world. Iris Murdoch has observed: "We differ, not only because we select different objects out of the same world, but because we see different worlds."[35] The transformation of the imagination, the conversion of our fundamental way of seeing, and therefore of living, is at the heart of moral growth.[36] Such transformation is a gift, but the classic disciplines of the Christian moral pilgrimage, repentance, prayer, and service, dispose the individual to be open to the transforming action of God, to a re-imaging of reality.[37]

Since the imagination is so central in religious experience, nourishment of the imagination is an important task. The playwright, Christopher Frye, has observed: "The imagination is something we train by saturating ourselves with the imaginative work of others. . ."[38] In terms of the religious imagination, the images of Scripture, the images of God offered for private prayer and public worship, the images of the possible world (whether Kingdom, or civilization of love), the Christian images of what it means to be human, are all rich and valuable sources for the nourishment of the imagination.

However, the importance of the imagination can also be understood from the standpoint of education as a secular endeavor. At the present time, a swing "back to basics" has been noted in educational circles. Too often, this means that the realm of the arts is devalued, in favor of reading and writing and 'rithmetic. In

higher education, perhaps the devaluing of the liberal arts in favor of business studies and computer literacy echoes this development. Within such a context, the value of the nourishment of the imagination is easily eclipsed. The role of music and theater and the visual arts is to reveal to a civilization its own essence, its deepest understanding of the universe, and humanity within it. Without the vision of the artists, the human person is diminished. And so, for secular educators, as well as religious, the imagination must be considered, the imagination needs to be nourished.

Aesthetic appreciation, aesthetic education is a necessary part of both secular education and religious education. It is needed if a person is to grow to a fullness of humanity, as well as if he or she is to become more fully Christian. Therefore, for the teachers in Catholic schools, a deepened understanding of the role of the imagination would seem to be necessary. Furthermore, such an exploration with the teachers could open the way to exploring aspects of the Catholic tradition in a way focused on Catholic identity and religious affections--precisely the kind of religious revitalization effort which Kelly cites as helpful in times such as our own. This would be valuable in any faculty development program.

Practical Implications

In order to assist students in developing Christian beliefs and values, the Catholic community, and the school as part of that community, needs a shared language of religious belief. However, various cultural factors seem to be impacting on our ability to focus on the specifically creedal dimensions of language. On the one hand, it is necessary to challenge cultural values which inhibit the ability to hand on our doctrinal tradition. On the other hand, it is wise to try to work with the positive forces in the culture. The teachers value handing on a tradition of Catholic Christian action. I think that should be the starting point of educational programs. The search for why we should teach our youth to be compassionate and tolerant could lead to an exploration of the "second language" of religious commitment.

Prior to, and more powerfully than in creedal formulas, religious faith is evoked by story, symbol, and song. Values are communicated in our vision of what the world and its human community can become. Since teachers apparently do not recognize the vital power of the imagination, exploration of this topic is needed. It would be most effective if it were both education about the imagination, in logical, left-brain style, and education of the

imagination, in imaginal, right-brain style. Such education could also help to evoke a vision of a more just world order, and thereby assist the teachers in developing a perspective which could more highly value the Church's social justice agenda.

Conclusion

I began this paper with a citation of sociological data which suggests that the nature of the instructional relationship between teacher and student has an influence on the religious formation of adolescents. The loving goodness of God can be mediated to students through their teachers. I would maintain that such action depends primarily on God's grace, and secondarily on the free response of the individual student. However, the self-understanding of the teacher would also play a role in this experience.

The study gives some general data about teachers which I suggest indicates a difference in the self-understanding of religious and lay persons teaching in our schools. What the study does not tell us is the degree to which these self-understandings are consciously held and critically appropriated by the teachers. Often, we are guided by beliefs and values which are not articulated, which are not evaluated. Often, as Bellah and his colleagues state, we have not learned the language which can give adequate voice to why we do what we do.

Catholic lay teachers say that they choose to teach in a Catholic high school, first, because they desire to teach in this kind of educational environment, and second, because of their love of teaching. What motivation lies at the heart of their work? Is it as I have argued, service, a diaconal ministry? Can they be assisted to tell the story of why they do what they do, and to name it as diaconal ministry? Can the framework of the *Pastoral Constitution* and its emphasis on the laity's role in the renewal of the temporal order prove helpful in an articulation of what their work means? These are questions which could be explored at the Symposium.

If teachers consciously see their work as diaconal, they are more likely to communicate that belief, that value, to their students, in informal conversations and in formal teaching settings. If teachers see the relationship between their teaching, and their Baptismal mandate to renew the temporal order, they may be more likely to perceive the importance of social justice teachings. Their relationship with their students will be influenced by this conscious self-understanding of themselves as engaged in a diaconal ministry.

Furthermore, if teachers explore the evangelical purpose of the school, they may be more open to placing a major emphasis on such characteristics as a clear understanding of the Bible, and an understanding and commitment to world peace. They may be more open to sharing their faith informally with students. Their relationship with their students would be influenced by their understanding of themselves as evangelizers, sharers of the gospel, the good news. Would the teachers be open to such a self-understanding? This, too, bears discussion at the Symposium.

The authors of the study conclude that the schools have a critical mass of teachers who can make important contributions to the religious formation of students. I concur. But I think that the value of that contribution can be deepened if teachers understand fully how important their role is. I think that contribution can be more effective if teachers are able to articulate their self-understanding of why they teach in a Catholic school. I think that contribution can be celebrated more fully, by the teachers and the church community, if it is seen as a ministry, diaconal and evangelical.

Endnotes

[1]Andrew Greeley, *The Religious Imagination*, New York: Sadlier, 1981, p. 51.

[2]Ibid, p. 66.

[3]Peter L. Benson and Michael J. Guerra, *Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers*, Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 1985, pp. 16-17.

[4]Ibid.

[5]A review of the headings in the *Catholic Guide To Periodical Literature* yields this information.

[6]John A. Coleman, "The Future of Ministry," *America*, March 28, 1981, p. 243.

[7]"An Easy Reading Condensation of the Lineamenta with a Reflection Essay and a Consultation Guide," prepared by Joe Holland and Bob Maxwell, The Pallotine Institute for Lay Leadership and Apostolate Research and The American Catholic Lay Network, 1986, pp. 7-8.

[8]Article 36.

[9]*To Teach As Jesus Did*, 102.

[10]*Sharing the Faith*, pp. 46-47.

[11]Ibid, p. 4.

[12]Ibid, p. 62.

[13]Robert N. Bellah, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler and Steven M. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985. See, for example, pp. 20-22.

[14]*Sharing The Faith*, p. 13.

[15]See, for example, Robert Gribbon, *The Problem of Faith Development in Young Adults*, Washington, DC: The Alban Institute, 1977.

[16]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 26.

[17]Ibid, p. 28.

[18]Ibid, p. 29.

[19]Ibid, p. 25.

[20]James Fowler, *Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*, New York: Harper and Row, 1981, especially chapters 19 and 20.

[21]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 40.

[22]Fowler, op. cit..

[23]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 41.

[24]Fowler, op. cit.

[25]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 30.

[26]Ibid, pp. 46-47.

[27]*Habits of the Heart*, p. 47.

[28]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 41.

[29]Ibid, p. 47.

[30]Ibid, p. 61.

[31]James R. Kelly, *A Study of the "RENEW" Program and Some of Its Impacts*, unpublished study sponsored and funded by The Lilly Endowment, Inc., 1986, pp. 259-262.

[32]*Sharing the Faith*, p. 47.

[33]For example, Thomas Groome, "Old Task: Urgent Challenge", *Religious Education*, Vol. 78, No. 4., Fall, 1983, p. 492-493, and Kathleen R. Fischer, *The Inner Rainbow*, New York: Paulist, 1983.

[34]Fischer, p. 8.

[35]Quoted by Craig Dykstra in *Vision and Character*, New York: Paulist, 1981, p. 22.

[36]Ibid, p. 69.

[37]Ibid, pp. 89-105.

[38]Quoted by Urban T. Holmes in *Ministry and Imagination*, New York: The Seabury Press, 1981, p. 105.

BUILDING RESPONSIVE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS: THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE, LONG RANGE DIOCESAN EFFORT IN THE RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT OF CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Robert J. Starratt, Ed.D.

Dr. Starratt directs the Center for Non-Public Education at Fordham University's Lincoln Center campus, where he serves as associate professor in the Division of Administration and Supervision of the Graduate School of Education. He previously directed the Commission on Research and Development of the Jesuit Secondary Association. He has authored a number of publications in the areas of supervision, curriculum, staff development and faith and justice. Dr. Starratt is a former Catholic high school principal and teacher of English and mathematics.

I. Introduction

The study, *Sharing the Faith: The Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers*, provides Bishops, superintendents, parents and scholars concerned about Catholic education with a valuable source of information about Catholic high school teachers. Those familiar with Catholic secondary schools will not be surprised by most of the findings, although some may project alarming long range implications of the findings.

In the study the summaries of the data speak for themselves and do not need highlighting here. Likewise the introductions to the summaries frame the data very well, using the latest perspectives of the Church on lay ministry, the integration of faith with all aspects of life, and the special concern for social justice and the transformation of unjust social structures. Finally, the recommendations and study guide questions are balanced and thought provoking. In short, this study represents an intelligent inquiry and an equally intelligent response to the findings. If nothing else comes of this present conference except a commitment to encourage Catholic educators and patrons to read and respond to the study and its recommendations, this Conference will have provided a beneficial service to the Catholic community.

I would like to offer additional commentary on the Church's responsibility to address the issues raised by the study, and then add further recommendations to the study. I wish to offer specific

responses to the study which Bishops, superintendents, school boards, parents, principals and teachers themselves might consider. Doubtless these recommendations will be supplemented by other commentaries and recommendations. The point at issue, however, is this: Does the study provide still further reasons for beginning a thoroughgoing effort at the religious development of Catholic educators--in this case Catholic High School Teachers? I am suggesting that the time for dramatic action is upon us. This Conference provides us an opportunity to take and to recommend far-ranging initiatives.

The study shows us three distinct groups of teachers in Catholic high schools: lay Catholic teachers, non Catholic teachers, and religious teachers (priests, brothers, sisters). Non Catholic teachers emerge as a distinct group. They present particular opportunities (ecumenical and educational) as well as challenges (to orthodoxy and orthopraxis). The response to them seems to call, not so much for corrective action, as for an intelligent framework by which to shape the special contributions they can make to the educational mission of the school in such a way that they can find an appropriate contribution to make to that mission. Is there a continuing conversation between them and their Catholic colleagues about how they approach various religious issues in the classroom? It would seem both unfair and irresponsible on the part of school authorities to hire non Catholic teachers and then not to provide for such orientation and ongoing conversations.

The religious teachers, for the most part, appear as the most supportive of orthodoxy and orthopraxis. The study shows them, however, as an aging group, many of whom are in their prime years or beyond. When projected over ten to twenty years, their present ages move them to retirement all too soon. The study does not show their relative influence on the other two groups of teachers nor on the present climate and culture of the school. Many within the Catholic educational community (though certainly not all) would perceive those religious as having a very large influence on the religious identity of the school. Be that as it may, the study tells us what we already know: for better or worse the presence of religious in Catholic schools will dwindle into insignificance in the next twenty years.

That leaves the third group, the Catholic lay teachers, as the group on whose shoulders the Catholic identity of the schools will rest. The data from the study offers both good news and bad news, although I would say the good news clearly outweighs the bad. The bad news lies more in the projection of present conditions over twenty years. As the twenty-five percent of the faculty currently

made up of brothers and sisters shrinks to eight or five percent in twenty years; as they are replaced by young Catholic or non Catholic teachers; as older, lay Catholic teachers reach retirement age and are replaced by younger teachers, who will see to the nurturing of the Catholic identity of the school?

Presently, the maintenance of a Catholic identity of the school is becoming increasingly problematic, even if we postulate a highly motivated and highly educated Catholic faculty. The present post Vatican II Church is currently being wracked by internal tensions between differing theological and pastoral factions in the Church. Even if we assumed a faculty in touch with the best in the conservative and progressive groups in the Church, it would be difficult to implement an educational program that exposed students in helpful ways to the legitimate differences one finds in the Church--even about what Church membership means. If we assume, as unfortunately we must, an increasing percentage of the faculty who neither know nor care about the ferment of thought going on in the Church today, then the direction the school should take in order to help the students move toward some kind of intelligent and mature membership in this Church becomes increasingly problematical. If we postulate, beyond that, as unfortunately it seems we must, the increasing disintegration of Catholic family life (a reflection of the trends in American families in general), the concomitant distress and confusion among adolescents with its attendant manifestations in increased teenage drug and alcohol consumption, teenage pregnancies, suicides, and many forms of escapism, then we arrive at an increasingly challenging task for Catholic educators to nurture a religious sense in their students.

In other words, under the best of circumstances, simply maintaining what we could call a genuinely Catholic quality to the education that goes on in our high schools will be difficult. To postulate a teaching faculty with no more understanding, commitment, and competence to nurture the religious growth of students than the current, younger and beginning teachers in Catholic high schools is to postulate a situation of grave crisis. This is not to disparage these young teachers. It is rather to call attention to their inability, without an ongoing and multifaceted support structure, to meet the challenges we currently face and will continue to face in the foreseeable future.

II. Present Inadequacies

Currently, the response to these challenges in many, if not most dioceses is inadequate. I do not wish to blame anyone. It is just that the situation has been slowly deteriorating and in most instances no one has named the crises we have been moving towards with enough forcefulness to shake a diocese into full alert. Instead, small measures have been initiated here and there, but they tend to be band-aids over a problem that requires a major therapy. Let us look at present realities.

1. At the high school level many dioceses have not made any provision for the updating of the majority of teachers (both lay and religious) in current scriptural or theological understanding. Neither have individual high schools. The orientation of new high school teachers to the Catholic mission and identity of the school is, in most instances, minimal. Ongoing programs of orientation for new teachers are non existent.

2. The culture of the high school encourages academic fragmentation, not integration; the isolation of teachers, not shared effort; the separation of college and state approved subject matter from religion; the relegation of moral and personal counselling to the chaplain and guidance people; the separation of life style and career issues from the ordinary classroom; the isolation of religious ritual to the chapel and off campus retreats. Few dioceses or individual schools challenge this accepted culture of the high school.

3. The vast majority of high school principals are unprepared to play an effective part in the religious development of their teachers. That concern is seldom mentioned in their job description, and when it is, it is seldom stated as a priority. There is nothing in the training of principals that deals with this; nothing in the criteria for hiring principals mentions this. If a principal were to be interested in making this a priority, she or he could have few resources at the diocesan level to call on. Workshops on computer-assisted instruction, on changes in state school laws, on fund raising and other topics may be available. But there is very little to help teachers grow in their understanding of their faith; little to help them develop instructional strategies to promote the integration of religious knowledge and secular knowledge; nothing for principals to help them help the teachers.

My point is that this state of affairs can no longer be tolerated. If Catholic schools are to have a future ten years from now, it will be due to our starting now. At the diocesan level we have to come up with a long range plan to deal systematically and on many levels with the ongoing formation of Catholic high school

teachers. Such planning should begin now and be pursued intensely.

Such a long range plan can take a variety of shapes. I wish to propose one plan, more with a view to stimulating discussions and critical reactions, than to offer a "one best way." I will divide the proposal into two parts: a four tiered set of teacher competencies, and then scenarios of an individual school at various stages of implementing the plan. The proposal is based on some assumptions which should be outlined first of all.

III. Assumptions

1. Staff development programs should focus on those competencies and characteristics teachers need in order to carry on one of their primary responsibilities as teachers in a Catholic school, namely to nurture the religious growth of their students in educationally appropriate ways. The promotion of the religious growth of teachers in Catholic schools should focus primarily on their role as teachers, not on their private religious development. That is to say, the staff development programs should not focus on developing the personal piety and devotion of the teacher. There may be voluntary programs such as faculty liturgies, retreats, prayer groups, etc., for that purpose. But the required staff development program should concentrate on what understanding and competencies they need as teachers in order to nurture the religious growth of their students more effectively. As they become increasingly involved with their teaching responsibilities to youngsters, they will, of necessity, have to confront their own religious experience.

2. The locus of most of the staff development work will be the individual school. Hence, diocesan wide workshops, seminars, etc., will be seen as supports and stimulants to the efforts at the school, where teachers will be engaged in ongoing programs of study, discussion, trial and error efforts with students. It is, however, in that continuous activity at the school, week in and week out, where teachers will learn and master this aspect of their crafts.

3. The principal will be a central person in this whole effort. The principal may not be involved in the development of every teacher, or in every staff development session. Nevertheless, the principal's leadership will be essential in calling for, coordinating and supporting the school-based staff development program. The principal, therefore, must understand what the staff development program is intended to accomplish, how it is supposed

to work, how various parts of the program fit various types of teachers at various parts of their careers. In so far as possible, therefore, the principal should become a staff development expert. All the research on school improvement points to the leadership role of the principal. In order for the principal to carry out this role, he or she must undergo the necessary training. The diocese has the responsibility to see to this training, either through its own training or through the assistance of some other agency or institution.

4. Besides highlighting the principal as the central person in carrying out the on-site staff development effort, we must focus also on the diocesan superintendent of schools. That person, along with the diocesan school board, will be responsible for initiating the whole planning process. That person will have to mobilize the diverse energies in the diocese to join him or her in the huge task of setting up and implementing a long range plan. The superintendent will, in most instances, have to convince the bishop to back this initiative. He or she may also have to convince a diocesan advisory or planning board. Throughout this whole process, the involvement of the superintendent will be crucial, for there will be many occasions when the planning and the implementation will be threatened. It will be the resolve of the superintendent that will keep the flame alive.

5. The long range plan should encompass ten years. Five years is not enough. It may take two years simply for the initiation of the planning process and the development of the first part of the plan. The first stage of the plan will necessarily be slow, in order to guarantee success at the start. As the scenarios of the plan will indicate, the on-site development of faculty will require time. Moreover, the teachers will feel more comfortable at the start when they see that the process takes account of all the built in problems that delay any enterprise as ambitious as this.

IV. Teacher Competencies for Nurturing the Religious Growth of Youngsters

The central argument of this paper is that our concern with the beliefs and attitudes of Catholic high school teachers ought to be directed at the connection between those beliefs and attitudes and what they are supposed to be teaching youngsters. In other words, if a concern raised by this present study is for the long term maintenance and development of the specifically Catholic mission of the Catholic high school, and if a long range staff development program is seen as a key to effecting that, then that staff development program ought to be guided by the desirable student

outcomes rather than by a direct effort to promote the personal piety and faith of teachers.

Faculty programs that directly address the personal faith and religious development of teachers, especially if they are obligatory, run the risk of invading privacy and forcing a kind of superficial compliance with prescribed observances. Schools, in cooperation with parishes, can offer opportunities to participate in prayer groups, seminars, special liturgies and paraliturgies, leaving people free to be involved or not.

On the other hand, it can be argued that all teachers have a responsibility under the general agreement of their contract to play a part in fostering the religious growth of their students. It is precisely because the words "play a part in fostering religious growth" are not specified, however, that many teachers feel free to ignore, soft-pedal, or prevaricate about that part of their job. If schools were to work with their teachers to arrive at reasonable, common sense descriptions of what those responsibilities are, then teachers could appreciate what kind of staff development workshops, seminars, courses, demonstration labs, etc., would be called for. Principals would have a better idea of the kinds of teacher-student interactions to be promoting. Then superintendents might have a better idea of the kind of diocesan support programs to fashion.

Not to preclude such discussions of teacher responsibilities to nurture the religious growth of their students, but rather to stimulate it, I wish to suggest four relatively distinct ways in which teachers can approach this responsibility. These four ways are described in greater detail in my paper, "The Religious Development of Catholic School Teachers" (available at the Center for NonPublic Education, Fordham University at Lincoln Center, New York, NY, 10023). I would hope that these suggestions would be modified, supplemented and adapted by any given faculty or diocese; I suspect that they cover much of the ground more ably discussed by such main line religious educators as Moran, Warren, Groome, DiGiacomo and Walsh, Nelson and others. The four ways are these: 1) precatechetical or foundational learnings; 2) expressly confessional learnings; 3) learnings under the influence of teacher modeling; 4) learnings dealing with contemporary critical issues. A brief description of these learnings follows.

1. Precatechetical or Foundational Learnings

Catholic schools ought to be nurturing their students' growth in those human areas that are the very soil in which religious

beliefs and practice can grow. We are all familiar with the principle that grace builds upon nature. We all believe that if religion is to be a vital part of a human being's life then it has to speak to those deepest aspects of our humanity; it must challenge us to be more fully alive. Hence, if a Catholic school is to nurture students' religious growth, it must build a human foundation for that growth. I wish to suggest five foundational learnings for religious growth: developing self-esteem; sharing interior wealth; using talents for the community; exploring the heroic; governing ourselves.

a) By developing self-esteem I mean that a youngster comes to an ever deepening appreciation of him or herself as a unique and special person; as an irrepeatable image of God's beauty and truth; as a person whose dignity and lovableness is guaranteed by God. Youngsters will come to this appreciation especially through their parents, but there is much that teachers can do to reinforce and deepen that sense of self-esteem. Many teachers have spontaneous ways to do that, whether it is telling a student what a great smile they have, or listening to a distraught youngster who has had an argument with his father. What I am suggesting is that teachers plan class activities that involve all their students in coming to appreciate how special they are. Furthermore, learning activities should be designed for every grade in ways that take account of the difficult stages of adolescent development.

b) As youngsters develop their sense of self-esteem, they should come to realize that their true wealth is what is inside them: it is what they are, rather than what they possess or look like on the outside. To be sure, many youngsters will develop self-esteem from their sense of what they are able to do (score touchdowns on the football team, defeat opponents in a debate tournament, perform in the lead role of the school play, bake a cake, fix a car, figure out a computer puzzle, win in a homeroom election etc.). The school should constantly try to drive the point home, however, that who you *are inside* is still more important than what you accomplish.

As adults we know that the most satisfying, most profound experience human beings can enjoy is the experience of sharing one's self with another human being. In friendship, in love relationships, in familial relationships, it is the sharing of one's inside life with another that is most intrinsically satisfying. That human experience provides the foundation for the development of the virtue of charity, that graced relationships between Christians, and between a person and God. Again, schools attempting to nurture the religious growth of students should provide opportunities for youngsters to experience this satisfaction of

sharing one's interior wealth with another person. Besides opportunities for the positive experience of sharing with another, the school should also expressly teach youngsters how to heal breaches in their relationships, how to forgive another person, how to ask for and accept forgiveness from another person.

c) Today's mass culture communicates the attitude that if one has some special talent, one ought to cultivate it for the exclusive benefit of the individual blessed with that talent. In other words, use your talents to get ahead in life, to gain entrance into prestige universities, which in turn will buy all the desirable things in life. The Catholic school should be sending a different message to its students. Our talents are given to us primarily to enrich the community. In a very real sense our talents belong to the community before they belong to us. Those talents, therefore, ought to be turned toward the enrichment of the community. Hence, those with any kind of talent--whether it be in the arts, in sports, in organizational ability, in a special ability to make people laugh, to fix cars, or whatever--ought to be encouraged to use those talents to enrich the school community, or the local parish or the larger civic community. By providing youngsters numerous and repeated opportunities to experience the intrinsic satisfaction of giving of one's talents, Catholic schools will be developing those fundamental attitudes of Christian service and generosity which are indispensable for the Church and civil society. Again, a little imagination is all it takes on the part of a handful of teachers to come up with numerous ways for schools to promote this in systematic and ongoing ways.

d) We don't need to read the Secret Life of Walter Mitty or observe the fantasies of Snoopy as the Red Baron to acknowledge that deep in the heart of every human being is the desire to do something special, to make some special contribution, to stand up to evil in its various forms with a resounding No! For some people heroism takes on rather pedantic forms such as being the neighborhood dominoes champion, or the best horse shoe pitcher in the county, or being known as the best crocheter in the neighborhood. For other people it means standing out in one's profession, as the best tax lawyer in the city, or as one of the most respected surgeons on the hospital staff. For others it may mean a career in politics, a career fighting crime, a career devoted to medical research, life in a cloistered monastery. Somehow we have to become somebody, to do something, other than simply sit around being part of the landscape. That intrinsic drive for the heroic can be channeled into healthy and productive life choices, or it can be dissipated in frivolous or even destructive choices. The invitation

to discipleship with Christ touches this deep chord in all of us. If youngsters have been expressly searching out the source and meaning of that longing, they will be more open to the influence of Jesus' example as they search for their own brand of heroism. Again, schools which claim to be preparing youngsters for adult membership in the Church ought to be spending much more time helping youngsters explore ways to channel their quest for the heroic. Do many teachers in Catholic schools know how to deal with this issue?

e) The final predisposition of religious growth in this list has to do with self-governance. Here I am referring not only to the ability to govern our own personal, individual lives, but also the ability of us as a group to govern our communal life together. The Catholic school tends to focus primarily on individual self-governance and to neglect the education of youth in communal self-governance. Yet anyone familiar with daily life in the schools knows that there are countless natural opportunities for engaging even young students in group self-governance. I am not suggesting that we leave the governance of the school in the hands of the students, nor that schools allow students to employ their barbaric tendencies when it comes to dealing with deviance on the part of some of their physically weaker peers. On the other hand, adults all too often step in and take charge when, with a little patience and some coaching, they could help the youngsters themselves deal with a situation that calls for communal self-regulation, such as food fights in the cafeteria, bullying in the school yard, scapegoating of children, destruction of school property, etc. Beyond controlling undesirable behavior, the student community could also marshal its own energies for more positive projects to benefit the whole school.

Adult life in the Church and even more so in civil society desperately needs communal self-governance in our neighborhoods, in our parks, in concentrated housing developments, in the observance of basic good manners in public life, in discussing and seeking the common good in protecting and fostering human rights in both the Church and civil society. Our schools should be preparing youngsters for this kind of participation in the adult Church and in adult civil society.

Let us suppose that Catholic schools really did an outstanding job in promoting these five predispositions to religious growth throughout every level of Catholic schools. Imagine the kind of Church we'd have in this country! We fundamentally know how to construct learning environments and learning activities to promote these predispositions. What we lack are the staff

development programs to develop those skills and attitudes in teachers to enable them to work with youngsters on these learnings.

2. Expressly Confessional Learnings

At the high school level, the formal teaching of religion is done by the Religious Education or Theology Department. It has puzzled me, however, that Catholic high schools seldom, if ever, let the rest of the faculty in on the big secret of what, precisely, the students are supposed to be learning in their religion courses. As teachers in a Catholic school, it seems to me that all faculty ought to have some minimal idea of what the school is teaching about Religion, if only to facilitate some possible reinforcement of that teaching in other classes. All the teachers are supposed to be concerned about the growth of the whole person. How can they be involved with that whole person when they have little or no knowledge of the religious issues the students are being exposed to in their religion classes? Furthermore, those teachers not involved in the religion department could be a valuable resource to that department by discussing and critiquing how religion is taught in the school. Similarly, there could be many opportunities throughout the school year for the rest of the faculty to refer to something that had been taught in the religion course that has come up in their own course--topics such as evolution vs. "creationism" in biology or history class; sexual ethics in literature class; political and social ethics in history class; imagery and symbol and ritual in literature class, etc. In any event, the whole faculty ought to be knowledgeable about the formal religious programs of the school, and ought to be expected to support that program in a variety of educationally appropriate ways.

3. The Influence of Teacher Modeling

Beyond the teaching competencies needed to promote specific foundational and advanced student outcomes, we can speak of some general qualities or attitudes a Catholic school wishes to promote in its teachers.

I am speaking now of more mature, personal qualities. Whereas in the previous sections, we could speak first of the desired *student* outcomes and then of the requisite competencies to *teach* for those outcomes, here we are talking about qualities one could only expect to be present in students inchoately because they assume levels of abstract understanding or emotional maturity or character development beyond what one could reasonably expect of children

or adolescents. Nonetheless, the school would want to expose youngsters to the example of adults with these qualities. One could further argue that these qualities will affect the ways teachers teach, such that their *absence* could undermine the pursuit of those foundational and religious outcomes.

I choose four qualities, although other qualities could likewise be chosen. The four qualities I label Ecclesial, Contemplative, Heroic and Incarnational. A brief profile of persons with these qualities will help.

a) *Ecclesial Persons.* They practice the central virtues of their religious community; are comfortable, but not pushy, when talking about their community; use their religious community's world view to make sense of major life dilemmas; show in their family lives the central values of their religious community; are respectful of religions different from their own; have obviously chosen to be an active member of this community and cherish membership in it; participate in that community's religious observances.

b) *Contemplative Persons.* They take time to appreciate quality. They look at things from various points of view; look beneath the surface of things; try to see the interconnectedness of things; find metaphors for human life in all kinds of natural phenomena (e.g., the seasons). They can celebrate God's presence in a variety of expressive activities, including liturgical prayer, poetry, music and film. They are persons who pray, if not easily, at least regularly; who find God revealing himself in every human effort to understand the universe and the human adventure; who appreciate the beauty, harmony, grandeur, pathos, delicacy and power of God's creation as it is revealed in their chosen discipline(s) of knowledge and in others; who wish to bring others to this deep appreciation of the above.

c) *Heroic Persons.* They have chosen not to be controlled by social pressures to conform, or by a need for security, or by fear, lust, greed, or anger. They direct their lives by their religious beliefs. In the face of enormous pressures to succumb to consumerism, selfishness, and cynicism, these people stand for something, have a sense of personal integrity, choose to pour out their lives for others, strive to make a difference, extend themselves beyond the expected role performance to a more generous, magnanimous response. They will not back away when sacrifice or suffering is involved.

d) *Incarnational Persons.* They believe that God is involved in human history. They find God revealing himself not only in nature but also in the pains and joys of human life. They hear God

calling to build his kingdom now, in history; their sacramental awareness affects the way they see everything, including other religious traditions. They find the glory of God in human beings.

Those labels may prove to be an obstacle to the teachers at your school. You may come up with more acceptable terms--e.g., a person faithful to a tradition, a person who takes time to feel the texture of life, a prophetic person, a person who reaches beyond mediocrity, a person involved with the flesh and blood of life.

4. Dealing With Contemporary Issues

There is yet another area of the religious development of the faculty in which schools can legitimately require faculty development. Graduates of Catholic schools ought to be functionally literate when it comes to understanding the most pressing religious issues of the day. That is to say, a graduate who can read the scriptures intelligently, knows the historical development of the credal dogmas of the Church, has an active private and liturgical prayer life, and lives by a clear set of personal moral principles, can nevertheless be functionally illiterate when it comes to dealing with critical, contemporary religious issues that affect the life of the Church and of civil society. I speak of issues such as women's rights, the ethics of biomedical experimentation, nuclear disarmament, business ethics, environmental ethics, global economic justice, social and political responses to systemic and structural injustice, etc.

Religion departments in most schools attempt to promote discussions and study of these important issues. The problem in many schools, however, is that other members of the faculty, including administrators, do not know very much about these issues. They may have a fuzzy sense of what schools of thought can legitimately exist with the blessing of the Church and which clearly would be excluded by the teaching of the Church as well as by the Gospel. The students are not stupid. They can easily perceive this lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of the rest of the faculty. Moreover, what is worse, they can perceive the positive lack of concern over these issues, the desire to keep those complicated matters at a distance.

I believe that Catholic schools can legitimately expect their teachers to be informed on these issues, so that they can engage their students in intelligent conversations about them, both in the classroom and in other informal settings around the school. The school has an obligation, therefore, to assist the teachers in their efforts to become informed, through formal seminars, seminars for

the faculty in which knowledgeable people are invited to speak to the faculty; through dissemination of pertinent reading material; through periodic assessment of the curriculum to see how those issues can be introduced appropriately in both religion and other academic courses.

If we pause at this moment and look back, we can see that there is in fact, a very large and substantial agenda for the religious development of the faculty in Catholic schools. The four substantive issues I have tried to identify (1. developing competencies to nurture foundational catechesis; 2. developing competencies to nurture expressly religious outcomes; 3. developing religious/spiritual qualities of the teacher; 4. developing faculty understanding of contemporary critical religious issues) provide us with handles, so to speak, when we want to wrestle with this difficult challenge of the religious development of the faculty. They are not necessarily the only handles we have or need. But perhaps they are sufficient for now to get the discussion started.

I would caution, however, that we approach these faculty development tasks not all at once, but with some developmental scheme in mind. That is to say, we should tackle preparations of the faculty to deal with those foundational predispositions first. Then, after some years of work on that, a school might start on the competencies for teaching the formal religious outcomes. After several years on those, some of the teachers would be ready to take up the latter two substantive areas, the religious qualities of the Catholic School teacher, or the critical religious issues. Such a developmental approach clearly implies a long-range plan. I will offer an example of a long-range plan that would accommodate a developmental phasing in of the four staff development areas. Again, this plan is offered as an illustration only; it offers us a feel for a serious planning effort. This plan will be presented in scenarios which reveal a ten-year plan at various stages of implementation.

V. Scenarios of a Long Range Plan

What follows are four scenarios of a school following through on a long-range plan for teacher development in the areas described above. Please remember that the individual school is the primary place where the plans are implemented. The scenarios are meant to illustrate one possible series of developments. In any given diocese or school, efforts at staff development already under way would change such scenarios considerably. I repeat. What

follows is only an illustration of a long range plan. I offer it only to get us thinking about the benefits of such planning.

The scenarios are presented in a backward order, starting with the tenth year and working back to the planning stage. The first scenario obviously assumes, therefore, that earlier stages in the ten-year plan have been reasonably successful and that most of the faculty are participating in the program.

1. The first scenario projects an entirely lay teaching staff of whom 10% are new teachers, 50% are young teachers (two to six years' teaching experience), 20% are veteran teachers (seven to fifteen years' teaching experience), 20% are senior teachers (sixteen to fifty years' teaching experience). The school is conducting ongoing staff development programs diversified according to these four groupings of teachers. The groupings are not ironclad; when appropriate, teachers might join other groups.

For the first group of teachers, the school provides a two-year program in the Basics of Catholic Education. Depending on their background and prior education, each one of these teachers is assigned various readings in teachings of the Church, Scripture, Catholic Philosophy, etc. These readings they discuss with either a veteran or a senior teacher who has been assigned as a mentor. The new teachers also attend in-school group sessions directed by various members of the faculty and administration on the goals and purposes of Catholic education, the various school policies which flow from the mission of the school (pastoral policies, discipline policies, graduation requirements, community service policies, etc.). These orientation seminars also introduce the new teachers to the faculty traditions and mores of the school, those unwritten rules and guiding values which animate the spirit of the faculty. Each teacher works with his or her mentor in a more clinical orientation to the mastery of basic teaching skills. This involves coaching, observation, planning, practicing, experimenting--all done under the guidance of the mentor.

The second group, the young teachers, are involved in a five-year program that is targeted on developing their competencies to handle the foundational catechesis and the formal religious outcomes. Besides meeting in formal seminars, this group is divided into three-person teams who work together in visiting one another's classes, discussing new strategies for responding to the students in these two major areas, evaluating what works and what doesn't work, and reporting back to the larger group. A team of senior teachers directs the program for these younger teachers, and that team recommends on the long-term employment decisions the

school may or may not offer to the young teachers after seven years at the school.

The third group, the veteran teachers, are involved in a program targeted to an in-depth development of the four spiritual qualities of the Catholic school teacher. This group is much more directly in charge of their own program. They meet with the principal three times a year to discuss the group's plans and programs. While there is considerable individualized activity, the group meets once a month, either for a discussion of various aspects of their own spirituality, to hear a speaker or a film, or to focus on ways to bring those spiritual qualities to bear on the formal and informal curriculum of the school in appropriate ways. This group is encouraged to utilize a broad range of diocesan resources for their program. Because this program is individualized, it can last between four and ten years.

The fourth group, the senior teachers, are asked to be, in one sense, the leaders of the school, those teachers who are at the cutting edge of developments in the Church, who are exploring the critical issues in the life of the Church and bringing concern for those issues back into the curriculum and instruction of the school. Besides developing their own awareness of these issues, they are asked to help the rest of the school community become at least initially aware of them. The senior teachers are also asked to help with the orientation of new teachers and the development of the young teachers. Again, they are encouraged to utilize a broad range of diocesan and regional resource people, both in attending seminars outside the school, in possibly organizing an assembly for the upper class students. They meet with the principal four or five times in the school year to discuss plans and programs.

Besides the formal programs in faculty religious professional development, the school would offer voluntary programs for personal religious development such as a program of spiritual direction, a faculty library of books and magazines dealing with religious topics, retreats and liturgies and prayer groups and volunteer community involvement projects.

That is a thumbnail sketch of the scenario at the end of ten years. Notice that the principal coordinates a lot of these in-house efforts, but that he or she has developed other in-house facilitators. Perhaps we can appreciate how the programs for the different groups try to respond to the developing levels of maturity among the faculty. But how did the school get there? Let us look at the scenario five years earlier to see what the program looks like as it is developing.

2. The faculty of the school would be predominantly lay (90-100%) made up of three groups at this time. 10% would be new teachers in their first or second year of teaching. They would be involved in the two-year orientation program we saw in the tenth-year scenario. Twenty percent of the faculty would not be participating in any significant way in the staff development program. These we can call the "Resisters." This group is made up of teachers of various ages. What unites them is a conviction that their contract does not call for this kind of staff development. Some would see it as an invasion of their right to privacy. Others would simply find it too threatening. The third group is made up of 70% of the faculty who are all involved in a five-year program to develop those competencies necessary to deal with the students in the foundational catechesis and in the formal religious outcomes.

The school would likewise have developed a voluntary program for the personal religious development of the faculty. Two to three members of the senior faculty may have expressed an interest in improving their spiritual direction skills. The school could pay for them to attend a three-summer program in spiritual direction. A faculty prayer group could be functioning. The diocese could compile a list of the twenty best retreat directors and the school can utilize that list in improving its faculty retreats.

A word about the "Resisters." Some of them will eventually join the large group and get involved in the five-year program. Others will retire, die or quit. A small "hard-core" may remain. The school may eventually attempt to convince them to work elsewhere, since it will have become painfully obvious that they simply don't belong there.

3. Let us look at one more scenario, the school in its third year of this plan. Approximately 90% of the faculty are lay teachers. There will be three groups in this scenario. The first group includes 60% of the faculty and is made up of the new teachers and a large cross section of the rest of the faculty. This group is going into a two-year orientation program in the Basics of Catholic Education, similar to the program described in the tenth-year scenario. In this case, however, the principal will be much more directly involved in carrying out the program, and he or she will be using central office personnel and other diocesan resource people more extensively. Again, the program will be individualized in terms of the individual teacher's background and education, but it will also involve large group seminars.

A second group will be made up of about 20% of the faculty who are veteran and senior teachers. These people would have already been involved in their own religious professional

growth and would not need the Basics Program. They will be undergoing a variety of individualized programs, some to equip them to serve as mentors to the new and young teachers, others to pursue other growth programs, others to work with diocesan personnel who are preparing the staff development program which is to deal with the foundational and advanced concerns--the program we find in place in the five and ten year scenario.

The third group would be the "Resisters," most of whom we met in the fifth-year scenario. This group would only be in the process of forming, and the principal would only gradually become aware of them as they began to drop out of the first group. The point of anticipating them in this scenario is to caution the principal and diocesan school office people not to over-react to their non-participation. They will have enough to do to manage the work with the first group without expending enormous amounts of energy worrying about the Resisters. Some effort, of course, is called for in order to uncover the reasons for their non-participation and to offer them, perhaps, alternative routes to meeting the objectives of the first group. Experience shows, however, that Resisters often occupy 80% of the administration's time. That simply cannot be allowed to happen in this case.

Another part of the third-year scenario is that the principals will be finishing up their own initial staff development training. During the first year of their baptism by fire, diocesan officials should have provided various support mechanisms, including opportunities once a month to share their experiences with other principals. If their training program was any good, it should have prepared them to expect a certain amount of turmoil, misunderstandings, crossed-up communications, even some plain, old, raw hatred. Even so, they need to be able to get off to the sidelines with their fellows to laugh at the crazy things that happened, to soak their bruises, to pray, and to gain some perspective. Diocesan officials, removed from the fray, will need to provide these opportunities for the principals.

A final component of this scenario is that the diocesan team will be field-testing some of their staff development components and doing some preliminary training of principals and other in-house facilitators, primarily to launch the five-year program to develop faculty competencies in the foundational and advanced areas which we saw as operational in the fifth and tenth year scenarios. This field testing and training would be necessary to launch that effort in the fourth or fifth year of the plan.

Scenarios for the first three years would show the diocese completing its plans, training its principals, pulling together

resource people in the region, establishing a support structure in the diocese, appointing at least one person to administer this effort on a full time basis, etc.

VI. Conclusion

This paper has attempted to respond to some implications of the study, *Sharing the Faith: the Beliefs and Values of Catholic High School Teachers*, especially the central issue of how to promote the Catholic identity of the school with a lay faculty that appears increasingly unprepared for that task. I have argued that the promotion of the Catholic identity of Catholic high schools is indeed possible, but that it will require the mobilization of the resources of the diocese for a sustained faculty development effort. The categories I have proposed and the plan which employs them as central emphasis on its faculty development scheme are not intended to exclude other categories or other planning proposals. They were meant primarily to illustrate a way to respond to the crisis into which Catholic high schools are moving. The question is, will we act now while we are able to shape the growth of Catholic high schools, or will we wait until the schools have drifted into such an amorphous identity that they will not seem worth the effort?

RESPONSES FROM TEACHERS

Angela Magliano, *a teacher of social studies at Preston High School in the Bronx, has devoted eleven years to Catholic secondary education. She is also active in her parish community.*

I find the study clarifies many issues and also raises some new ones. I agree that the Catholic high school teacher is indeed one of the key forces in religious and value formation. I disagree with the teacher in the study who stated, "The integration of Catholic principles into secular subjects--sociology, psychology, history--is not a strong point of most Catholic schools with which I am familiar. Teachers of these subjects are not prepared to do this." In other words, she's claiming the integration of values in secular areas doesn't occur. As a teacher of the social sciences, I don't know how I can avoid values. Students are always interested in turning discussion to moral questions: issues that are on their minds, in the news. It's an opportunity and a challenge for every teacher, whatever the subject.

In order to promote religious formation, it is necessary to have dialogue, not only within the schools, but also within the system. Teachers of the same academic disciplines would benefit from increased interaction. Also, the Pastorals need to be explained and lessons designed as teacher aids so they can be successfully integrated into classroom work. If these materials are already available, perhaps communication must be improved to increase our awareness of them. In my experience, we are an insular system; it is rare that support and reinforcement come from outside the school or even the department. Sharing between departments is necessary. Often the religion curriculum, a central and essential element of the school, is not well known and therefore is not integrated in what could be a cohesive interdisciplinary approach.

My own formal religious education was pre-Vatican II. Is there any wonder that I refer any questions on doctrine, liturgy and ritual to our religious education department? The study is astute in discovering that lay teachers are more comfortable in communicating values about self and social responsibility than in talking about religious faith rooted in Catholic tradition. Faculty workshops and collaborative efforts at the school and diocesan level might identify needs and develop religious education programs for the school staff. Also, teachers must take the responsibility to avail

themselves of opportunities to strengthen their knowledge, and should be encouraged to do so. I had never heard of *Sharing the Light of Faith*, the National Catechetical Directory, before I received this invitation.

The study suggests that concerns for social justice are not top priorities for many teachers who put lower values on seeking systemic change than expressing compassion. For me, the four life goals dealing with social justice listed in the study are vaguely worded and therefore do not elicit a strong response for action on behalf of justice. Also, without coordinated efforts to promote concrete and practical movement, individuals feel insignificant and perhaps cannot strongly relate to the ideals. What is needed is leadership to influence and direct constructive action.

The idea of teaching as ministry must be reinforced regularly to ensure that the many unique aspects of teaching in a Catholic school can be endorsed. Lay people must be helped to feel comfortable with spreading the faith. Imagine my dismay when abortion came up in a discussion in my daughter's seventh grade history class, and her teacher cut off the discussion because she didn't want to put ideas into their heads. One of my reasons for sending her to a Catholic schools is so she would get ideas--Catholic ideas! Another consideration is the fact that among non-Catholic laity are non-Christians whose perspectives on many issues vary dramatically from the Catholic stance; care must be exhibited that their beliefs are not communicated, even by innuendo, to an impressionable class. Lifestyle arrangements which are an affront to Catholic moral standards must be kept private.

There are times when lay teachers can feel excluded from school decisions, and this can create tension. By virtue of their shared community life, religious can be privy to information about school that is not available to lay teachers. Insensitivity to this feeling of not being part of the "inner circle" can create difficulties. Also, religious must be encouraged to frequent school areas used during free time by lay faculty. Then professional dialogue and mutual respect and colleagueship can be reaffirmed in an atmosphere of camaraderie.

I feel that positioning lay teachers' compensation at the end of the list of recommendations is one aspect of the study that must be discussed. This issue is critical and should be near the top of the list. A teacher who is preoccupied with the limitations of salary, or

feelings of inequity or denials of self-worth might exhibit some resistance to additional expectations. She/he simply will not do more--or cannot do more because of outside job commitments. Catholic schools cannot be well served by staffs dominated by the very young who are in transition to higher paying jobs, or those who work simply for supplementary income. I don't know the solution to the problem, but I believe the issue must be addressed.

Questions of governance must also be addressed. The relatively minor roles that lay people play in administration leave them with little incentive for professional growth and limit the desirability of remaining in the system. And if different perspectives about school policies are not welcomed, our schools may draw compliance rather than commitment from teachers.

Dr. Nelson's analysis of the covenantal mindset is important. The survey indicates teachers are motivated by a more covenantal than contractual mindset, the former enhanced by a faithful love, the latter by justice. Does this mean that only self-sacrificing individuals will be attracted to staffing our schools? Will the spirit of Catholic schools be altered if elements of equity, just compensation and delegation are negotiated? Will more talented and dedicated teachers be encouraged to remain within the system? Will less value-oriented people be drawn to apply?

In the mindset of Catholic Christianity, Dr. Nelson suggests that lay persons need to strengthen institutional commitment. Dr. Starratt points out the need for formal education in religion. I'd like to add another consideration. With the scarcity of trained religious, leadership in programs is sometimes assumed by well-intentioned lay people with limited preparation. Exposure to poorly led programs can "turn people off." Screening, coordination and training of these well-intentioned leaders is needed if lay teachers are to be encouraged to further their own religious education. As educated professionals, we teachers are selective as to who will motivate and enhance our commitment. There are talented lay people whose backgrounds make them valuable sources of leadership in religious formation. They must be identified and encouraged.

The mindset "discipleship" raises several issues for me. That lay teachers tend to identify themselves as professionals rather than as ministers is to a large extent due to the fact that the concept of ministry is foreign to them, and perhaps they have not defined their

own life goals in such an all-encompassing manner. But consciousness can be raised, providing room for growth.

Dr. Nelson describes a discipleship that is revolutionary and countercultural. I agree. Catholics are a minority group in the United States and must withstand pressure from the dominant secular culture. A Catholic school student must eventually leave the comforting confines of the school environment and apply what he/she has learned in a hostile world. We must teach our students and teachers to question authority--outside school and inside school. Too often we avoid and discourage conflict--but it is a prerequisite to growth, a necessary ingredient for life.

Dr. Fox indicates that the contribution of teachers could be described as a ministry that is both diaconal and evangelical. But teachers must be helped to understand and articulate why they teach in a Catholic school. Most lay teachers don't come packaged with a religious orientation and introspection, finely honed, to help explain their motivations for choosing to join a Catholic school faculty. In a tight job market, perhaps this is where the openings were found. Maybe they had fond memories of their own high school days. In my own case, I educate my children in Catholic schools and feel I have a vested interest. It was only while on colloquium six years ago that I was introduced to the concept of ministry, and this gave me another dimension to what had been an undefined motivation. So I'm not surprised to find lay teachers emphasizing the diaconal aspects of the school's mission. But clearly the evangelical mission of the school needs development. Articulating and implementing this concept and developing concrete programs, such as those proposed by Dr. Starratt, must be a priority.

•••••

John Foley *has taught religious education at Xavier High School in New York City for eighteen years, simultaneously serving as adjunct associate professor of philosophy at St. Peter's College. He was one of the original architects of the Colloquium on the Ministry of Teaching and has presented talks to a number of church groups in the New York area.*

I don't know how I would have answered some of the questions on the survey. Why do I teach in Catholic school? When I started eighteen years ago, it was the only position available. I wanted to teach college, but like the man who came to dinner, I'm still in high school. I must admit I have difficulty with surveys and statistics, but bold strokes should not be ignored. Concerned people put them together. Something must be being said here.

I see a crisis in Catholic education. What do we do now? The research states the case clearly. What does it mean for a school to be Catholic? We can't avoid the issue.

Catholic educators who work together in a Catholic high school participate in a functioning collegiality but live different lifestyles that are grounded in different communities: family or clerical. Here, I use "family" in its broadest sense to include those married and single, and "clerical" to refer to those who have taken or will take vows to live in religious community or as clerics. So, for instance, my foundational community is my family, and my priorities as a Christian are clearly husband, father and teacher. The Jesuit community is the foundation for many with whom I share the teaching ministry at Xavier High School. We come together to function, to serve, to minister to students in their own human growth. Hence, it is important to acknowledge the distinction between our *foundational communities*, which may be clerical or familial, and our collegiality within a *functional community*, namely, in service to students within a Christian context. Too often, I suspect, efforts to unite faculties have wavered and failed because different people were understanding "community" to mean one had to change his or her own lifestyle to that of the other. Clerics had to be "laicized" and lay people were expected to act "clerically." It is our function, our church ministry (a shared community), that pulls us or can pull us together. Of course, the experience of a lived Christianity in our families and religious communities can strengthen our own capacity for discipleship as teachers and support us in our spiritual growth.

Today we need to be conscious of red flag words, baggage we carry. Consider the term "religious," which comes from the Latin *religare*, binding oneself to God consciously. We are all called to be religious, sacramental, and that means preparation, receiving, making ourselves sacramental. But the word "religious" may sometimes be used in ways that seem to slight the spirituality of the laity.

When I look at the three papers, the "development" of the individual is key. Many of us were raised when children were meant to be seen, not heard. If we talked about our own experiences, that bespoke a certain amount of pride, so we didn't talk about them--that's a mistake, but that's part of the problem when we begin to expect our teachers to become actively involved in sharing their faith. Many of us are pre-spiritual rather than non-spiritual. How do we somehow enable people on our faculties to grow spiritually? Christ told us how--in Luke's gospel Christ sends out disciples to do three things: share the table, heal, preach. We have to be careful not to reverse the order. We have to begin by inviting teachers to share with one another. No one makes us learn, believe, forgive, love. We are all invited to learn, believe, forgive, love. The work of enlarging our self-understanding has to be done as a community. Staff development has to be rooted in the local school where staff hears one another. The NCEA program for principals, "Shepherding the Shepherds," is one attempt to do this. It invites principals to share mutual support, to use their desk as a bridge to the faculty, not as a barrier.

•••••

John J. Reilly, *a retired Marine and former high school social studies teacher, has served as president of the Philadelphia-based National Association of Catholic School Teachers since its founding in 1978. He also holds membership in the Non-Public School Council of the American Federation of Teachers and the Political Education Council of the AFL-CIO.*

I work extensively with teachers in their day-to-day experience of teaching. I, too, believe there is a crisis, but not quite as outlined in the papers. I agree there is a need for religious formation, staff development for teachers. Teachers have been calling for this for a long time, and in general it has not been forthcoming.

Many teachers want and have been asking for assistance in their own personal development. It's my experience that most teachers come into their work with an awareness of what Catholic schools are about. They sometimes acknowledge that they may not have all the background needed, but they do come in with a deep respect for Catholic schools and a strong desire to become involved in the Catholic school system.

So the groundwork, the foundation is there. What have we built on that foundation, and what do we face today? Are schools in a crisis because "laity are taking over and they don't have the right background"? That kind of attitude triggers a deep resentment in me, that anyone would question my Catholicity, my commitment to Catholic schools.

If we are in a crisis today because the laity are taking over Catholic education, what were the religious doing when the laity were being trained? If we are not trained, why blame us? Lay teachers want to be involved in what is going on in the school, on more than one level. They're not students, but they believe they are sometimes considered on a hierarchical scale somewhere between the students and the religious faculty.

Administrators need to be aware of where lay teachers are and where they are coming from. This is particularly true in regard to the language of staff development. The use of the term ministry scares me--the more we talk about it, the less I understand it.

If you talk about my vocation as a Catholic school teacher, you're on target, and I understand you. The terminology used has to be carefully thought out and possibly rethought. Don't keep it on a

high level; talk it out with laity. Have you wondered where the resisters come from? What they have experienced, seen, heard--things done by administration or by community? They resist, they say they won't buy into that package. I don't think resisters are unchangeable. They can be changed, and they will rethink their positions. But you've got to talk with them, not at them.

I admit that sometimes a group of older teachers can influence new ones negatively. We need to address the older ones, get them not to tell their war stories and horror tales in the faculty room. Work with them. Change the way things are done. In some situations the principal may not be the best one to implement some of these efforts, but the work is usually best done on the school level. Diocesan programs are often more remote, less in touch with the reality of teachers' experience.

I would ask administrators to keep in mind that their lay teachers can be as committed as they are to Catholic education, but they are also committed to family, a second job, the requirements for certification, etc. When you implement a program, consider their time commitments. They may not be able to accommodate your proposed schedule without difficulty. Involve them in the planning.

And social justice doesn't begin in a foreign country with poor people. It begins at home, in the Church, in the school system. Our students can perceive contradictions between what we teach and what we do, between what the Church teaches and what Church institutions do.

If we expect laity to make a career out of Catholic teaching, then what will we do about long range goals to keep them there? Are church officials committed to survival of the system, to keeping good teachers on the faculties? What do we intend to do to make this a viable career? When will we begin to implement these steps?

Among the lay teachers I know, these things are true:
they're committed to Catholic schools;
they want to work there;
they want to make a career of it.

And so the foundation is there. But unless we really work with that foundation and offer a meaningful role for the laity in the development of students and decision-making in schools, we are headed for collapse. Whose schools are they? Ours, all of us.

*****

Bro. Myles Amend, CFC *has worked for three years in Catholic high schools. He presently teaches social studies and religion at Rice High School in Harlem, where he also serves as Development Director. Brother Myles also chairs the Committee on Apostolic Involvement of Students for the Eastern Province of the Christian Brothers.*

As a day-in, day-out practitioner of the art of teaching, and as someone who meets students and teachers from many other schools, I'll start with what I consider to be the beginning, middle and end of Catholic high school: kids.

Catholic schools originally developed to serve the needs of children of immigrant families. A crying need was answered by huge numbers of religious men and women, mostly women, who built a great system. Its primary agenda was evangelization--developing in students an intimate relationship with Christ and a commitment to an active life of faith. Along the way, they developed the skills and talents of their students, taught the 3 R's, instilled pride in Church and country.

If we make allowance for life in simpler times, teachers then had something many of us today have difficulty finding--a clear vision of what schools were all about. Today, we are working with the children, grandchildren and great grandchildren of immigrants. And what do our schools produce? To use language of corporate America, let's look at the bottom line. If kids are the beginning, middle and end of the Catholic high school, then the bottom line is the Catholic high school graduate. What should a Catholic high school graduate look like? I suggest four characteristics: He or she should have an intimate relationship with Christ and a commitment to an active life of faith. He or she must be a person equipped with the knowledge and the skills necessary to face life in the 21st century. He or she must be a person committed to peace, to a world based on justice, where discrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual identity, economic status, or religion is absolutely repugnant, and where the structural roots of injustice are understood and addressed as intrinsically evil. He or she must be a person willing to accept positions of leadership in the world and in the Church and who understands that leadership means service.

It doesn't seem to me that the goal of the Catholic high school has changed all that much, but the complexities of the task have certainly grown, as have the obstacles. It is as true today as it was

over one hundred years ago: a teacher, in union with parents, can be the greatest influence in an adolescent's life. Today, with more broken families, the role of the teacher is even more important.

This study, *Sharing the Faith*, assumes its greatest importance when looked at in light of the fact that kids are the sole/soul reason (I use both spellings and both meanings of that word here) for the existence of our Catholic high schools. The need for what Catholic high schools offer has not changed, and the goal is still the same, but the avenues taken to fulfill the need and reach the goal must change if we are to survive.

For us, teaching is a ministry. Understanding teaching as ministry is imperative if we are to maintain our Catholic identity. As the number of religious on the faculty is reduced, it becomes increasingly incumbent on religious communities to ensure continuity, the continued identity of Catholic schools as expressions of the evangelical visions of our founders and communities. And if these efforts are to succeed, we religious have to bring lay teachers into decision-making in our schools.

Our schools have to be centers of justice. Our expectations must be just. We must model justice in our hiring policies. We need to make covenant a term that describes our schools. The walking school of Jesus described by Dr. Nelson would not be accredited by a regional association, but if we are to strive for anything in reasserting Catholic identity, then discipleship is the way to go--we must walk with Jesus.

We need to take our methodology from Jesus, the great teacher. We need to invite all our teachers to discern appropriate roles for themselves in religious education, and our administrators must both lead the way and hold us accountable.

I'm not so sure that we are at the point of absolute crisis suggested by Dr. Starratt, but I do think we're on a threshold. We can go back inside where it's warm and cozy or go outside. If we go inside we'll be okay for about 10 years--then we may be choked by what once seemed so safe. Outside we may stumble, but the ministry of teachers is to shed light in darkness. We ask our kids to accept challenges; shouldn't we be willing to accept them, too? As Jack Nelson says, let's go for it.

PARTICIPANTS

Bro. Myles Amend, CFC, *Teacher. Rice High School. 74 West 124th Street. New York. NY 10027*

Dr. Peter Benson, *President. Search Institute. 122 West Franklin. Suite 525. Minneapolis. MN 55404*

Dr. Bernard Bouillette, *Headmaster. Loyola Academy. 1100 North Laramie Avenue. Wilmette. IL 60091*

Rev. James Bradley, SJ, *Commission on Research/ Development. Jesuit Secondary Education Association. Fordham University at Lincoln Center. 113 West 60th Street. New York. NY 10023*

Sr. Loretta Carey, RDC, *NCEA/Fordham Center for Justice and Peace Education. Fordham University at Lincoln Center. 113 West 60th Street. New York. NY 10023*

Sr. Judith Coreil, MSC, *Director. Curriculum/Inservice. National Catholic Educational Association. 1077 30th Street NW. Suite 100. Washington. DC 20007*

Rev. Charles Costello, SJ, *President. Jesuit Secondary Education Association. 1424 16th Street NW. Suite 300. Washington. DC 20036*

Sr. Nora Cronin, PBVM, *Academic Assistant to the Headmaster. Loyola School. 980 Park Avenue. New York. NY 10028*

Rev. Rodney DeMartini, SM, *Secretary. NCEA Secondary School Department. 22622 Marianist Way. Cupertino. CA 95014*

Most Rev. Edward Egan, *Vicar for Education. Archdiocese of New York. 1011 First Avenue. New York. NY 10022*

John Foley, *Teacher. Xavier High School. 30 West 16th Street. New York. NY 10011*

Dr. Zeni Fox, *Center for Youth Ministry Development. 157 Wheaton Place. Rutherford. NJ 07070*

Rev. Henry Frascadore, *President, Northwest Catholic High School, 29 Wampanoag Drive, West Hartford, CT 06117*

Rev. Thomas Gallagher, *Secretary for Education, United States Catholic Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005*

Michael J. Guerra, *Executive Director, Secondary School Department, National Catholic Educational Association, 1077 30th Street NW, Suite 100, Washington, DC 20007*

Rev. James Heft, SM, *Chair, Religious Studies Department, University of Dayton, 300 College Park Avenue, Dayton, OH 45469*

Angela Magliano, *Teacher, Preston High School, 2780 Schurz, Bronx, NY 10465*

Bro. Joseph Mahon, FSC, *Director of Education, Brothers of Christian Schools, Box 29, Adamstown, MD 21710*

Rev. Edwin McDermott, SJ, *Director, Institute for Catholic Educational Leadership, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94117*

Sr. Catherine McNamee, CSJ, *President, National Catholic Educational Association, 1077 30th Street NW, Suite 100, Washington, DC 20007*

Sr. Ann Moore, CND, *Associate Superintendent, Diocese of Fall River, 423 Highland Avenue, Fall River, MA 02720*

Bro. Frederick Mueller, FSC, *Principal, LaSalle Academy, 612 Academy Avenue, Providence, RI 02908*

Dr. John Nelson, *Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education, Fordham University, Bronx, NY 10458*

Rev. Vincent Novak, SJ, *Dean, Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education, Fordham University, Bronx, NY 10458*

Rev. J. Stephen O'Brien, *Executive Director, Department of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education, National Catholic Educational Association, 1077 30th Street NW, Suite 100, Washington, DC 20007*

Bro. Michael O'Hern, FSC, *Director of Catholic Secondary Schools, Archdiocese of Chicago, P. 0. Box 1979, Chicago, IL 60690*

Bro. Anthony Pistone, SM, *Assistant Provincial, St. Louis Province of Marianists, P. 0. Box 23130, St. Louis, MO 63156*

John Reilly, *President, National Association of Catholic School Teachers, 1700 Sansom Street, Suite 903, Philadelphia, PA 19103*

Rev. Robert Stamschorr, *Editor, St. Mary's Press, Terrace Heights, Winona, MN 55987*

Dr. Robert J. Starratt, *Director, Center for Non-Public Education, Fordham University at Lincoln Center, 113 West 60th Street, New York, NY 10023*

Sr. Patricia James Sweeney, SSJ, *President, NCEA Secondary School Department and Principal, Cathedral High School, 260 Surrey Road, Springfield, MA 01118*

Patricia Tierney, *Superintendent of Catholic Schools, Diocese of St. Augustine, P. 0. Box 2400, Jacksonville, FL 32241*

Published by the Secondary School Department, National Catholic Educational Association, Suite 100, 1077 Thirtieth Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20007-3852.

Price: $4.00 NCEA Members
$5.30 Non Members